Gallahue, Mathew J. Factors influencing drastic increase in juvenile court offenders between ages thirteen and fifteen.

Service Paper
1949
Copy 2

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

LIBRARY

Gallahue, M.
Serv. Paper
1949
c.2
stored

The Gift of Matthew J. Gallahue

Ed.
Service Paper
Gallahue, M.J.
1949
c.2
stored

EdM
1949
gal
c.2

FACTORS INFLUENCING DRASTIC INCREASE IN JUVENILE COURT OFFENDERS BETWEEN AGES THIRTEEN AND FIFTEEN

A Service Paper

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

Boston University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Matthew Joseph Gallahue

A. B. Boston College, 1943

August 1949

Boston University
School of Education
Library

School of education
September 22, 1952
37810
c. 2

First Reader: William C. Kvaraceus, Professor of Education

Second Reader: J. Wendell Yeo, Professor of Education

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

https://archive.org/details/factorsinfluenci00gall

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND AND SOURCE OF PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Purpose of study	1
	Early literature	2
	Source of problem	4
II.	THE PROBLEM:- RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES	10
	Time element chosen	10
	Choice of factors	10
	Selection of cases	11
	Assumptions made	12
	Conclusions expected	12
	Previous studies	13
III.	TREATMENT OF DATA	15
	Age at court appearance	15
	Comparison of offenders according to number of offenses	18
	Reason for referral	19
	Home area or neighborhood of offenders	25
	Economic conditions of home	30
	Size and position of offender in family	34
	Truancy - school retardation	38
	Religious affiliation	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND AND SOURCE OF PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Purpose of study	1
	Early literature	2
	Source of problem	4
II.	THE PROBLEM:- RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES	10
	Time element chosen	10
	Choice of factors	10
	Selection of cases	11
	Assumptions made	12
	Conclusions expected	12
	Previous studies	13
III.	TREATMENT OF DATA	15
	Age at court appearance	15
	Comparison of offenders according to number of offenses	18
	Reason for referral.....	19
	Home area or neighborhood of offenders	25
	Economic conditions of home	30
	Size and position of offender in family	34
	Truancy - school retardation	38
	Religious affiliation	42

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Group affiliation	45
	Gregariousness of offenders	49
IV	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	53
	Summary	53
	Conclusions	54
	Age	54
	Offenses	55
	Neighborhood	55
	Economic conditions	56
	Truancy, school retardation	56
	Religion	58
	Club affiliation	58
	Companionship in delinquencies	59
	Guidance recommendations	59
	Limitations of this study	60
	Suggestions for further study	61
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	63

CHAPTER PAGE

Group affiliation 45

Regularousness of offenders 49

IV SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH 53

Summary 53

Conclusions 54

Age 54

Offenses 55

Neighborhood 55

Economic conditions 56

Truancy, school retardation 56

Religion 58

Club affiliation 58

Companionship in delinquencies 59

Guidance recommendations 59

Limitations of this study 60

Suggestions for further study 61

BIBLIOGRAPHY 63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Age distribution of offenders arraigned before the Boston Juvenile Court from January 1, 1946 to December 31, 1946	5
II.	Juvenile delinquency cases, 1945; ages of boys and of girls when referred to court, in cases disposed of by 374 courts.	7
III.	Offenders according to age at reference	16
IV.	Distribution of offenders according to offense	21
V.	Distribution of offenders according to neighborhood	26
VI.	Ten year total offenders by districts	27
VII.	Distribution of offenders according to occupations of father	32
VIII.	Distribution of offenders according to size of family	35
IX.	Distribution of offenders according to position in family	37
X.	Percentage distribution of offenders according to truancy and retardation	40
XI.	Distribution of offenders according to religious affiliation	44
XII.	Distribution of offenders according to group (club) membership in 1946	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Age distribution of offenders arraigned before the Boston Juvenile Court from January 1, 1946 to December 31, 1946	5
II.	Juvenile delinquency cases, 1945: ages of boys and of girls when referred to court, in cases disposed of by 374 courts.	7
III.	Offenders according to age at reference	16
IV.	Distribution of offenders according to offense	21
V.	Distribution of offenders according to neighborhood ..	26
VI.	Ten year total offenders by districts	27
VII.	Distribution of offenders according to occupations of father	32
VIII.	Distribution of offenders according to size of family	35
IX.	Distribution of offenders according to position in family	37
X.	Percentage distribution of offenders according to truancy and redardation	40
XI.	Distribution of offenders according to religious affiliation	44
XII.	Distribution of offenders according to group (club) membership in 1946	47

TABLE PAGE

XIII. Distribution of offenders according to number of companions at time of offense in 1946 50

TABLE PAGE

XIII. Distribution of offenders according to number of companions at time of offense in 1916 50

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND SOURCE OF PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of juvenile delinquency is not entirely a new problem. It is not peculiar to the modern world alone. There have always been bad boys, bad girls, child criminals. Much research has been done on the various causes, explanations, and factors leading to crime and delinquency. Much more has been written of efforts to prevent crime, both juvenile and adult. Social work, boys clubs, guidance centers, psychiatrists, probation officers, juvenile courts, employment centers, all have contributed their part toward prevention. Delinquency, however, is still with us. Research, therefore, must go still further.

This study is intended to be a comparison of two groups of court offenders, one a recidivist group and the other a group of first offenders. Both groups will be over thirteen years of age and under fifteen.

II. PURPOSE OF STUDY

An attempt will be made to focus attention on the following:- (1) an analysis of the factors leading to the drastic

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND SOURCE OF PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of juvenile delinquency is not entirely a new problem. It is not peculiar to the modern world alone. There have always been bad boys, bad girls, child criminals. Much research has been done on the various causes, explanations, and factors leading to crime and delinquency. Much more has been written of efforts to prevent crime, both juvenile and adult. Social work, boys clubs, guidance centers, psychiatrists, probation officers, juvenile courts, employment centers, all have contributed their part toward prevention. Delinquency, however, is still with us. Research, therefore, must go still further.

This study is intended to be a comparison of two groups of court offenders, one a recidivist group and the other a group of first offenders. Both groups will be over thirteen years of age and under fifteen.

II. PURPOSE OF STUDY

An attempt will be made to focus attention on the following:- (1) an analysis of the factors leading to the drastic

increase in the number of court offenders between age thirteen and fifteen; (2) prevention of further offenses through concentration of effort on first offenders at this crucial age level; and (3) through the use of accurate guidance at pre-adolescent ages, in channeling gregariousness and gang spirit to more socially healthful activities, it is hoped to prevent court appearance.

III. EARLY LITERATURE

Early in the career of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, organized in London in 1815, we find that it conducted what we now call research into the causes of delinquency. Its list of causes sounds much like the same type of inquiry today:--

> homelessness, parental neglect, abnormal family relations; want of mental, moral, and religious education; want of employment and dislike of work, destitution; the corrupting influence of prisons, "flashhouses" of drink, debauchery, and all manner of wickedness; and the fairs in and about London, where temptation seduced young lads into thefts, for which their subsequent comitment to prison sealed their ruin. [1]

The recent or modern situation with regard to juvenile crime in the United States seems well summed up as follows:

> Youthful offenders are an especially serious factor in the crime problem of the country. Young

---

[1] Enoch C. Wines, State of Prisons (Cambridge, Mass.: J. C. Wilson & Son 1880), p. 75.

increase in the number of court offenders between age thirteen and fifteen; (2) prevention of further offenses through correctation of effort on first offenders at this crucial age level; and (3) through the use of accurate guidance at pre-adolescent ages, in channeling irregularnesses and zeal spirit to more socially healthful activities, it is hoped to prevent court appearance.

III. EARLY LITERATURE

Early in the career of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, organized in London in 1815, we find that it conducted what we now call research into the causes of delinquency. Its list of causes sounds much like the same type of inquiry today:--

> homelessness, parental neglect, abnormal family relations; want of mental, moral, and religious education; want of employment and dislike of work, dissipation; the corrupting influence of prisons, "flashhouses" of drink, debauchery, and all manner of wickedness; and the lairs in and about London, where temptation seduced young lads into thefts, for which their subsequent confinement in prison sealed their ruin.[1]

The recent or modern situation with regard to juvenile crime in the United States seems well summed up as follows:

> Youthful offenders are an especially serious factor in the crime problem of the country. Young

---

[1]Enoch C. Wines, State of Prisons (Cambridge, Mass.: J. C. Wilson & Son 1880), p. 72.

people between fifteen and twenty-one years of age constitute only 13 per cent of our population above fifteen but their share in the total amount of serious crime committed far exceeds their proportionate representation. They are responsible for approximately 26 per cent of our robberies and thefts; they constitute some 40 per cent of our apprehended burglars, and nearly half of our automobile thieves. Boys from seventeen to twenty are arrested for major crimes in greater number than persons in any other four-year group. They come into court, not for petty offenses, but for serious crime, twice as often as adults of thirty-five to thirty-nine; three times as often as those of forty-five to forty-nine; five times as often as men of fifty to fifty-five. Nineteen year olds offend more frequently than persons of any other age, with eighteen year olds next. Moreover the proportion of youths less than twenty-one in the whole number of persons arrested, has increased by 15 per cent during the past three years, 108,857 not yet old enough to vote were arrested and finger-printed last year.[2]

When we look at the causes of this alarming state of affairs, we find there are two major causes: (1) forced idleness and unemployment among the youth of the land; and (2) the disinclination to accept hard work even when available. We are quite aware that the old family discipline has all but disappeared from the city and is rapidly breaking down in the country; hence, the former restraints upon youthful criminality are being reduced at the very moment when the incentives to juvenile delinquency are becoming more marked and potent. Moreover, the growing complexity of civilization of urban life, and better facilities for both formal and informal education are bringing about a spirit of premature sophistication and adventure in youth. In short, they enter the stage of adult experience, or at least adult experimentation, at a far earlier age than before and with less traditional discipline to restrain them.[3]

---

[2] Thorsten Sellin, "The Criminality of Youth," Prison Journal, 57-58, April-July, 1940.

[3] Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Revision 1947), p. 113.

people between fifteen and twenty-one years of age constitute only 19 per cent of our population above fifteen but their share in the total amount of serious crime committed far exceeds their proportionate representation. They are responsible for approximately 26 per cent of our robberies and thefts; they constitute some 40 per cent of our aggravated burglaries, and nearly half of our automobile thieves. Boys from seventeen to twenty are arrested for major crimes in greater number than persons in any other four-year group. They come into court, not for petty offenses, but for serious crime, twice as often as adults of thirty-five to thirty-nine; three times as often as those of forty-five to forty-nine; five times as often as men of fifty to fifty-five. Nineteen year olds offend more frequently than persons of any other age, with eighteen year olds next. Moreover the proportion of youths less than twenty-one in the whole number of persons arrested, has increased by 15 per cent during the past three years, 108,857 not yet old enough to vote were arrested and fingerprinted last year.[2]

When we look at the causes of this alarming state of affairs, we find there are two major causes: (1) forced idleness and unemployment among the youth of the land; and (2) the disinclination to accept hard work even when available. We are quite aware that the old family discipline has all but disappeared from the city and is rapidly breaking down in the country; hence, the former restraints upon youthful criminality are being reduced at the very moment when the incentives to juvenile delinquency are becoming more marked and potent. Moreover, the growing complexity of civilization of urban life, and better facilities for both formal and informal education are bringing about a spirit of unreality concerning education and adventure in youth. In short, they enter the stage of adult experience, or at least adult experimentation, at a far earlier age than before and with less traditional discipline to restrain them.[3]

---

[2] Thorsten Sellin, "The Criminality of Youth," Prison Journal, 27-28, April-July, 1940.

[3] Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Revision 1947), p. 112.

Thus it seems that not only has there been bad children down through the years but the circumstances and causes contributing to their difficulties have been similiar. In addition it would appear from these previous statements that many, in fact a majority of our major crimes, are committed by those who a very few years earlier had been numbered among our juvenile law breakers. Constant research into those same causes and problems that worried people nearly a century and a half ago, and continues to worry Americans today, is necessary if proper prevention programs are to be undertaken for the elimination of juvenile delinquency.

IV. SOURCE OF PROBLEM

In a statistical summary at the Boston Juvenile Court the following table was brought to light:

Thus it seems that not only has there been bad children down through the years but the circumstances and causes contributing to their difficulties have been similar. In addition it would appear from these previous statements that many, in fact a majority of our major crimes, are committed by those who a very few years earlier had been numbered among our juvenile law breakers. Constant research into those same causes and problems that worried people nearly a century and a half ago, and continues to worry Americans today, is necessary if proper prevention programs are to be undertaken for the elimination of juvenile delinquency.

IV. SOURCE OF PROBLEM

In a statistical summary at the Boston Juvenile Court the following table was brought to light:

TABLE I

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS ARRAIGNED BEFORE THE BOSTON JUVENILE COURT FROM JANUARY 1, 1946 TO DECEMBER 31, 1946

Age Group	Number of male offenders	Number of female offenders	Total
7 - 10 Years	52	--	52
11 and 12 Years	62	11	73
13 Years	47	18	65
14 Years	91	32	123
15 Years	110	45	155
16 and over	116	59	175

Note: Age of offenders is determined as of last birthday before arraignment.

TABLE I

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS ARRAIGNED BEFORE THE BOSTON JUVENILE COURT FROM JANUARY 1, 1940 TO DECEMBER 31, 1945

Age Group	Number of male offenders	Number of female offenders	Total
7 - 10 Years	52	--	52
11 and 12 Years	62	11	73
13 Years	47	18	65
14 Years	91	32	123
15 Years	110	45	155
16 and over	115	60	175

Note: Age of offenders is determined as of last birthday before arrangement.

It can be seen from Table 1., p. 5 that, while the number of male and female offenders increases throughout adolescence, the sharpest increases for both boys and girls lies between ages thirteen and fifteen where the number of offenders in both categories is practically doubled. Girls appear before the court much later than boys. No girl under ten appeared in 1946. Their number at the age of eleven and twelve is rather small, but increases very sharply from there on. The number of boys remains fairly even under the age of fourteen and experiences an increase thereafter. However, the tendency to increase is not as sharp as in the case of girls. The greatest increase in number of offenders seems to occur during the pubertal period, which coincides also with the transition from the eighth grade to high school, a period which on one hand presents new demands on the young individual and on the other induces him to seek for more freedom from parental authority.

The following table, published by the Children's Bureau in Washington, tends to confirm the figures of the Boston Juvenile Court and show that the abrupt increase at the thirteen to fifteen age period is not a local phenomenon nor peculiar to one year alone.

It can be seen from Table I., p. 5 that, while the number of male and female offenders increases throughout adolescence, the sharpest increases for both boys and girls lies between ages thirteen and fifteen where the number of offenders in both categories is practically doubled. Girls appear before the court much later than boys. No girl under ten appeared in 1924. Their number at the age of eleven and twelve is rather small, but increases very sharply from there on. The number of boys remains fairly even under the age of fourteen and experiences an increase thereafter. However, the tendency to increase is not as sharp as in the case of girls. The greatest increase in number of offenders seems to occur during the pubertal period, which coincides also with the transition from the eighth grade to high school, a period which on one hand presents new demands on the young individual and on the other induces him to seek for more freedom from parental authority.

The following table, published by the Children's Bureau in Washington, tends to confirm the figures of the Boston Juvenile Court and show that the abrupt increase at the thirteen to fifteen age period is not a local phenomenon nor peculiar to one year alone.

TABLE II

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CASES, 1945; AGES OF BOYS AND OF GIRLS WHEN REFERRED TO COURT, IN CASES DISPOSED OF BY 374 COURTS *

	Juvenile Delinquency Cases					
	Number			Per Cent		
Age of child when referred to court	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls
Total cases	122,851	101,240	21,611	---	---	----
Age reported	110,415	91,435	18,980	100	100	100
Under 10 years	4,172	3,763	409	4	4	2
10 years, under 12	8,032	7,311	721	7	8	4
12 years, under 14	18,362	15,558	2,804	17	17	15
14 years, under 16	40,872	32,645	8,227	37	36	43
16 years and over	38,977	32,158	6,819	35	35	36
Age not reported	12,436	9,805	2,631	---	---	----

* Social Statistics, Juvenile Court Statistics, 1945, United States Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C., p. 11.

TABLE II

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CASES, 1945: AGES OF BOYS AND OF GIRLS WHEN REFERRED TO COURT, IN CASES DISPOSED OF BY 374 COURTS *

Age of child when referred to court	Number			Per Cent		
	Total	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls
Total cases	122,851	101,240	21,611	---	---	---
Age reported	110,115	91,435	18,680	100	100	100
Under 10 years	4,172	3,763	409	4	4	2
10 years, under 12	8,092	7,311	781	7	8	4
12 years, under 14	18,362	15,558	2,804	17	17	15
14 years, under 16	40,872	32,645	8,227	37	36	43
16 years and over	38,677	32,158	6,519	35	35	36
Age not reported	12,736	9,805	2,931	---	---	---

* Social Statistics, Juvenile Court Statistics, 1945, United States Children's Bureau, Washington, D. C., p. 11.

While the age periods selected by the Children's Bureau is slightly different from that used by the Juvenile Court, the period selected by each is sufficiently close to be significant for the purposes of this study.

The Children's Bureau figures for 1946 have not yet been released for publication at this time, however the percentages are similiar to the 1945 figures for both boys and girls.

This study will devote its attention to the drastic increase of boy court offenders between thirteen and fifteen. Many factors have allegedly been responsible for this increase. This study is to show what we feel are the crucial factors in the increase and which we hope will be borne out by the results of the study.

It would seem to follow from logical deduction that the increase after thirteen must be due to first offenders. If this increase were due to the first offenders from the previous year the number of recidivists would not be much greater than those from the twelve-year-old group, but certainly it would not be twice as large. Thus interest would seem to be pointed toward boys who appear as first offenders in the thirteen to fifteen age group. We also would like to compare them with recidivists at the same age level. The hypothesis being that different factors will be at work between these groups.

This study does not claim to be novel or different in focusing attention on the jump in court offenders at the thirteen to

While the age periods selected by the Children's Bureau is slightly different from that used by the Juvenile Court, the period selected by each is sufficiently close to be significant for the purposes of this study.

The Children's Bureau figures for 1945 have not yet been released for publication at this time, however the percentages are similar to the 1945 figures for both boys and girls.

This study will devote its attention to the drastic increase of boy court offenders between thirteen and fifteen. Many factors have allegedly been responsible for this increase. This study is to show what we feel are the crucial factors in the increase and which we hope will be borne out by the results of the study.

It would seem to follow from logical deduction that the increase after thirteen must be due to first offenders. If this increase were due to the first offenders from the previous year the number of recidivists would not be much greater than those from the twelve-year-old group, but certainly it would not be twice as large. This interval would seem to be pointed toward boys who appear as first offenders in the thirteen to fifteen age group. We also would like to compare them with recidivists at the same age level. The hypothesis being that different factors will be at work between these groups.

This study does not claim to be novel or different in causing attention on the jump in court offenders at the thirteen to

fifteen age level. The Children's Bureau has been publishing statistics on court offenders for years and in 1942 issued the statement that during the past ten years the age distribution had been virtually constant. This study is particularly interested in the guidance of boy delinquents and the discovery through research or any other means, new, plausible, scientific attacks, upon the problem of child delinquency which will aid in its elimination or at least its diminution.

fifteen age level. The Children's Bureau has been publishing statistics on court offenders for years and in 1942 issued the statement that during the past ten years the age distribution had been virtually constant. This study is particularly interested in the guidance of boy delinquents and the discovery through research or any other means, new, plausible, scientific attacks, upon the problem of child delinquency which will aid in its elimination or at least its diminution.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM:- RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES

I. TIME ELEMENT CHOSEN

It was the original intent of this study to confine itself to consideration of the offenders who had appeared before the court in either one month or in three months of the year 1946. The year 1946 was chosen because it was post-war, thus avoiding to some extent the abnormal strains and tensions of the war period. Many of the boys were over the age limits at which the most drastic increases occur. Some were too young. Others had been recorded in the docket but had never appeared in court. Still others, for reasons of the court, were not available for study. Thus the one or three-month study originally thought sufficient in number to be significant, was perforce eventually extended to include the entire year 1946 with, of course, the above exceptions.

II. CHOICE OF FACTORS

In addition to the age factor, which treats of boys who had reached age thirteen but who had not yet become fifteen years of age, the beginning study hoped to include factors as, behavior in school,

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM:- RESEARCH PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES

I. TIME ELEMENT CHOSEN

It was the original intent of this study to confine itself to consideration of the offenders who had appeared before the court in either one month or in three months of the year 1946. The year 1946 was chosen because it was post-war, thus avoiding to some extent the abnormal strains and tensions of the war period. Many of the boys were over the age limits at which the most drastic increases occur. Some were too young. Others had been recorded in the docket but had never appeared in court. Still others, for reasons of the court, were not available for study. Thus the one or three-month study originally thought sufficient in number to be significant, was perforce eventually extended to include the entire year 1946 with, of course, the above exceptions.

II. CHOICE OF FACTORS

In addition to the age factor, which treats of boys who had reached age thirteen but who had not yet become fifteen years of age, the beginning study based to include factors as, behavior in school,

results of mental tests, personality characteristics, relations to parents and siblings. Because some of these factors were not found common to most cases, it was found necessary to exclude them. Others were found too all-encompassing for the purposes of a study such as this. Eventually the following factors were chosen because of their significance and because they were found most likely to be common to all cases considered:- (1) age at court appearance; (2) comparison of offenders according to number of offenses; (3) offense for which boy appeared before court; (4) area of city in which boy lives; (5) economic condition of home; (6) position in and size of family; (7) record of truancy, school grades, retardation; (8) religious affiliation; (9) group affiliation and (10) offense committed as individual or as a member of group. Data concerning these factors have been procured (1) from the records of the Boston Juvenile Court; (2) from case histories of the Boston Juvenile Court; (3) from school reports; and (4) from interviews with parents and guardians.

III. SELECTION OF CASES

Cases have been selected primarily according to age and whether first offenders or recidivists. As already has been mentioned, cases of boys are selected whose offenses have occurred after their thirteenth and before their fifteenth birthday. An equal number of first offenders and recidivists should be treated. By recidivists is meant those offenders having two or more court appearances in separate offenses. The time period is that mentioned in

results of mental tests, personality characteristics, relations to parents and siblings. Because some of these factors were not found common to most cases, it was found necessary to exclude them. Others were found too all-encompassing for the purposes of a study such as this. Eventually the following factors were chosen because of their significance and because they were found most likely to be common to all cases considered:- (1) age at court appearance; (2) comparison of offenders according to number of offenses; (3) offense for which boy appeared before court; (4) area of city in which boy lives; (5) economic condition of home; (6) position in and size of family; (7) record of truancy, school grades, retardation; (8) religious affiliation; (9) group affiliation and (10) offenses committed as individual or as a member of group. Data concerning these factors have been procured (1) from the records of the Boston Juvenile Court; (2) from case histories of the Boston Juvenile Court; (3) from school reports; and (4) from interviews with parents and guardians.

III. SELECTION OF CASES

Cases have been selected primarily according to age and whether first offenders or recidivists. As already has been mentioned, cases of boys are selected whose offenses have occurred after their fifteenth and before their fifteenth birthday. An equal number of first offenders and recidivists should be treated. By recidivists is meant those offenders having two or more court appearances to separate offenses. The time period is that mentioned in

the Age Distribution Table of the Boston Juvenile Court, January 1, 1946 to December 31, 1946. Table III, p. 5.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS MADE

In undertaking this study is was assumed that results will indicate the following:- (1) different factors are at work between first offenders and recidivists at the thirteen and fifteen age level; (2) among these factors are the strains and tensions of adolescence and the tendency to break away from home influences and become a member of an organized or an unorganized group or gang; (3) the home situation of first offenders at thirteen to fifteen is better than that of first offenders at younger ages.

V. CONCLUSIONS EXPECTED

The following conclusions are expected as a result of this study:- (1) statistics do not show the number of delinquents increasing steadily until age sixteen but show drastic jumps between thirteen and fifteen; (2) malign maturation takes place at these ages among court offenders; (3) a greater funneling of guidance processes and effort is necessary at ages below thirteen and between thirteen and fifteen to help prevent the sharp jumps in first offenders at the thirteen to fifteen age levels; and (4) greater effort on the part of youth agencies and groups is necessary to keep youth interested in organized group membership during this critical period.

the Age Distribution Table of the Boston Juvenile Court, January 1, 1924 to December 31, 1926. Table III, p. 5.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS MADE

In undertaking this study it was assumed that results will indicate the following:- (1) different factors are at work between first offenders and recidivists at the thirteen and fifteen age level; (2) among these factors are the strains and tensions of adolescence and the tendency to break away from home influences and become a member of an organized or an unorganized group or gang; (3) the home situation of first offenders at thirteen to fifteen is better than that of first offenders at younger ages.

V. CONCLUSIONS EXPECTED

The following conclusions are expected as a result of this study:- (1) statistics do not show the number of delinquents increasing steadily until age thirteen but show drastic jumps between thirteen and fifteen; (2) social readjustment takes place at these ages among court offenders; (3) a greater lengthening of guidance processes and effort is necessary at ages below thirteen and between thirteen and fifteen to help prevent the sharp jumps in first offenders at the thirteen to fifteen age levels; and (4) greater effort on the part of youth agencies and groups is necessary to keep youth interested in organized group membership during this critical period.

VI. PREVIOUS STUDIES

While there is much written on the subject of age in delinquency studies and in criminology it is seemingly inconclusive and in disagreement, although the authors consulted are outstanding in their particular fields of study. For instance, Sutherland[1] says

> The juvenile court statistics show the number of delinquents increasing steadily until age sixteen and boys' court statistics show the same process until eighteen or nineteen. Thus there is no sharp break at the age of puberty, though this is often assumed to be a period of personal disorganization.

On the other hand Reckless[2] says, "The age factor is revealed by a graph which shoots precipitously up through the adolescent years, reaches its peak in the young adult ages and tapers off with advancing age thereafter."

The Gluecks[3] in their study say "One boy was arrested at the age of 6, 71 or 7.1% at 11 or 12 years; 270 or 27.2% at age 13 or 14; 159 or 16% at 15 or 16 and 4% at age 17, the mean being 11 years, 11 months."

According to Banay[4] however

---

[1]Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939)

[2]Walter C. Reckless, Criminal Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940) p. 97.

[3]Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents (Cambridge: University Press, 1934) p. 97.

[4]Ralph S. Banay, Youth in Despair (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1948) p. 83.

VI. HEAVIOUS STUDIES

While there is much written on the subject of age in delinquency studies and in criminology it is seemingly inconclusive and in disagreement, although the authors consulted are outstanding in their particular fields of study. For instance, Sutherland[1] says

> The juvenile court statistics show the number of delinquents increasing steadily until age sixteen and boys' court statistics show the same process until sixteen or nineteen. Thus there is no sharp break at the age of puberty, though this is often assumed to be a period of personal disorganization.

On the other hand Reckless[2] says, "The age factor is revealed by a crash wd ch shoots precipitously up through the adolescent years, reaches its peak in the young adult ages and tapers off with advancing age thereafter."

The Glueck[3] in their study say "One boy was arrested at the age of 6, 7% or 7.1% at 11 or 12 years; 27% or 27.2% at age 13 or 14; 15% or 16% at 15 or 16 and 4% at age 17, the mean being 11 years, 11 months."

According to Healy[4] however

---

[1] Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939)

[2] Walter C. Reckless, Criminal Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940) p. 77.

[3] Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents (Cambridge: University Press, 1934) p. 77.

[4] Ralph S. Healy, Youth in Despair (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1940) p. 83.

Analysis of annual reports published by the Childrens' Bureau produces a different set of figures.

Age	Boys
Under 10	5.3 %
10-12	12.0 %
12-14	22.8 %
14-16	39.3 %
16 and over	20.6 %

British studies show that the occurrence of delinquency among boys is greatest in the 14-16 year age bracket, but it exceeds only slightly the incidence in the 10-15 year-old bracket.

These few quotations from the literature on the subject show to some extent the disagreement in interpretation of statistics on age, which exists among the authors in this field.

Analysis of annual reports published by the Children's Bureau produces a different set of figures.

Age	Boys
Under 10	5.9 %
10-12	12.0 %
12-14	22.8 %
14-16	39.3 %
16 and over	20.6 %

British studies show that the occurrence of delinquency among boys is greatest in the 14-16 year age bracket, but it exceeds only slightly the incidence in the 10-15 year-old bracket.

These few quotations from the literature on the subject show to some extent the disagreement in interpretation of statistics on age, which exists among the authors in this field.

CHAPTER III

TREATMENT OF DATA

The records in 417 cases of boy offenders in the Boston Juvenile Court between January 1, 1946 and December 31, 1946 were read and checked and of these only ninety-eight were found suitable for this study. Of the ninety-eight, fifty-five were found to be first offenders and forty-three were recidivists. This chapter will attempt to compare the recidivists and first offenders, using the ten factors listed on page 11. Chapter II, as a basis for comparison.

I. AGE AT COURT APPEARANCE

The following table compares the two groups according to age at the time they were brought before the court.

CHAPTER III

TREATMENT OF DATA

The records in 417 cases of boy offenders in the Boston Juvenile Court between January 1, 1946 and December 31, 1946 were read and checked and of these only ninety-eight were found suitable for this study. Of the ninety-eight, fifty-five were found to be first offenders and forty-three were recidivists. This chapter will attempt to compare the recidivists and first offenders, using the ten factors listed on page 11. Chapter II, as a basis for comparison.

I. AGE AT COURT APPEARANCE

The following table compares the two groups according to age at the time they were brought before the court.

TABLE III

OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO AGE AT REFERENCE

Age Classification	Mean Age	Average Age	Minimum Age	Maximum Age
First Offenders	14- 0-27	14.4	13-1- 1	14-11-28
Recidivists	14- 4-18	14.14	13-1-10	14-11-27
Recidivists at First Offense	11-10-28	11.78	8-3- 2	14- 2-25
Entire Group	14- 2-11	14.39	13-1- 1	14-11-28

TABLE III.

DEFINITIONS ACCORDING TO AGE AT REFERENCES

Age Classification	Mean Age	Average Age	Minimum Age	Maximum Age
First Offenders	14- 0-27	14.4	12-1- 1	14-11-28
Recidivists	14- 4-18	14.14	12-1-10	14-11-27
Recidivists at First Offense	11-10-28	11.78	4-2- 2	14- 2-25
Native Group	14- 2-11	14.39	13-1- 1	14-11-28

It may seem, since the study is confined to a rather narrow age group, that no significant or interesting observations might be made. However in Table III, page 16., it is noted that the mean age of the recidivists at time of referral in 1946, is higher than that of first offenders and yet not high enough to assume that they could not have come within this age group at the time of their first offense.

In trying to find significant ages from the guidance point of view, it might be well to note the mean age of reference of recidivists at the time of first offense. This is eleven years, ten months and twenty-eight years. Yet the minimum is close to eight years. Thus it would seem that guidance of a social nature should have its beginning in school in the very first grade with concentration centered on pre-adolescent and adolescent ages. School is specified since it would seem that youth agencies would fail to reach many of the extremely low-age groups and apparently the homes have not succeeded in offering the necessary guidance to turn these youngsters from the sort of adventure which leads to court appearance.

The mean age of the entire group compares favorably with the significant age grouping of the Children's Bureau in their Social Statistics Publications, the Statistical Summary of the Boston Juvenile Court for 1946 and the figures shown for a ten-year period, 1938-1947, in a statistical study made at the Boston Juvenile Court. It is also noted that the maximum age at the time of first offense for recidivists was fourteen years, two months and twenty-five days. Thus it would seem that this fellow must have appeared in court a

It may seem, since the study is confined to a rather narrow age group, that no significant or interesting observations might be made. However in Table III, page 16., it is noted that the mean age of the recidivists at time of referral in 1946, is higher than that of first offenders and yet not high enough to assume that they could not have come within this age group at the time of their first offense.

In trying to find significant ages from the guidance point of view, it might be well to note the mean age of reference of recidivists at the time of first offense. This is eleven years, ten months and twenty-eight years. Yet the minimum is close to eight years. Thus it would seem that guidance of a social nature should have its beginning in school in the very first grade with concentration centered on pre-adolescent and adolescent ages. School is specified since it would seem that youth agencies would fail to reach many of the extremely low-age groups and apparently the boys have not succeeded in offering the necessary guidance to turn these youngsters from the sort of adventure which leads to court appearance.

The mean age of the entire group compares favorably with the significant age grouping of the Children's Bureau in their Social Statistics Publications, the Statistical Summary of the Boston Juvenile Court for 1946 and the figures shown for a ten-year period, 1938-1947, in a statistical study made at the Boston Juvenile Court. It is also noted that the maximum age at the time of first offense for recidivists was fourteen years, two months and twenty-five days. Thus it would seem that this fellow must have appeared in court a

second time, very soon after his first offense, since the maximum age under consideration was fourteen years, eleven months, twenty-eight days. Several recidivists came within this category. The necessity for a very special type of guidance for this type of offender was recognized by the court when in 1936 it first organized The Citizenship Training Department of the Court, an agency which studies the boy mentally, physically, and in various activities and makes recommendations based on a complete case study.

II. COMPARISON OF OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF OFFENSES.

The names of all children brought before the Boston Juvenile Court are checked with the Massachusetts Department of Probation (a centralized, statistical and indexing agency for all Massachusetts courts) for the purpose of finding whether the offender has had a prior appearance in any Massachusetts court. Fifty-five of the offenders in the age group studies here, were found to have no appearances prior to 1946 and thus were to be considered as first offenders. Those offenders having one or more court appearance prior to 1946 were considered recidivists. Forty-three boys came within this category.

The Gluecks [1] found that of 1,000 juvenile court offenders

---

[1] Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940) p. 16.

second time, very soon after his first offense, since the maximum age under consideration was fourteen years, eleven months, twenty-eight days. Several recidivists came within this category. The necessity for a very special type of guidance for this type of offender was recognized by the court when in 1936 it first organized the Outdoor Training Department of the Court, an agency which studies the boy mentally, physically, and in various activities and makes recommendations based on a complete case study.

II. COMPARISON OF OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF OFFENCES.

The names of all children brought before the Boston Juvenile Court are checked with the Massachusetts Department of Probation (a central, statistical and indexing agency for all Massachusetts courts) for the purpose of finding whether the offender has had a prior appearance in any Massachusetts court. Fifty-five of the offenders in the age group studies here, were found to have no appearances prior to 1940 and thus were to be considered as first offenders. Those offenders having one or more court appearance prior to 1940 were considered recidivists. Forty-three boys came within this category.

The Glueck[1] found that of 1,000 juvenile court offenders

---

[1] Sheldon and Eleanor T. Glueck, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1940) p. 16.

only 374 boys had no prior appearance in court. This is at variance with the findings in this study. It should be pointed out, however, that the group studied by the Gluecks were boys who were sent to the Judge Baker Guidance Center because of poor adjustment on probation in the court, or because of unusual circumstances in the offense for which they were brought to court. More often than not the evidence of their non-adjustment was subsequent appearance in court. Thus it cannot be considered that the Glueck study represented a true cross section of the male offenders.

> Rarely is it pointed out that the cases studied were not typical of the total work of the court and, as the Gluecks point out, only when he felt really puzzled or saw that the juvenile before him obviously had some physical or mental handicap would he (Judge Cabot) refer him to the clinic for examination. [2]

The excess of first offenders over recidivists in our study would tend to confirm our contention in Chapter I that the increase in number of court offenders, after age thirteen, is due to first offenders. From a percentage standpoint, 56 per cent of all the offenders in this age group were first offenders.

III. REASON FOR REFERRAL

The ninety-eight boys included in this study appeared before the court for twenty different reasons or offenses. Six offenses were common to both recidivists and first offenders. Six

---

[2]Hon. John F. Perkins, Common Sense and Bad Boys and Other Essays (Boston: The Citizenship Training Department of the Boston Juvenile Court, 1946) p. 12.

only 37% boys had no prior appearance in court. This is at variance with the findings in this study. It should be pointed out, however, that the group studied by the Glueckes were boys who were sent to the Judge Baker Guidance Center because of poor adjustment on probation in the court, or because of unusual circumstances in the offense for which they were brought to court. More often than not the evidence of their non-adjustment was subsequent appearance in court. Thus it cannot be considered that the Glueck study represented a true cross section of the male offenders.

> Rarely is it pointed out that the cases studied were not typical of the total work of the court and, as the Glueckes point out, only when he felt really puzzled or saw that the juvenile before him obviously had some physical or mental handicap would he (Judge Cabot) refer him to the clinic for examination. 2

The excess of first offenders over recidivists in our study would tend to confirm our contention in Chapter I that the increase in number of court offenders, after age thirteen, is due to first offenders. From a percentage standpoint, 56 per cent of all the offenders in this age group were first offenders.

III. REASON FOR REFERRAL

The ninety-eight boys included in this study appeared before the court for twenty different reasons or offenses. Six offenses were common to both recidivists and first offenders. Six

---

2Hon. John F. Perkins, Common Sense and Bad Boys and Other Essays (Boston: The Citizens'Trading Department of the Boston Juvenile Court, 1946) p. 12.

reasons were listed among first offenders alone and eight offenses were committed only by the recidivists.

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO OFFENSE

Offense	Number First Offenders	Number Recidivists	Per Cent First Offenders	Per Cent Recidivists	Per Cent Total
Larceny	21	19	38.2	44.2	40.5
Runaway	20	7	36.4	16.3	27.7
Br. & Enter. & Larceny	2	4	3.6	9.3	6.2
Others	12	13	21.8	30.2	25.6
Total	55	43	100.	100.	100.

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS ACCORDING TO OFFENSE

Offense	Number First Offenders	Number Recidivists	Per Cent First Offenders	Per Cent Recidivists	Per Cent Total
Larceny	21	19	38.2	44.2	40.5
Runaway	20	7	36.4	16.3	27.7
Br. & Enter. & Larceny	2	4	3.6	9.3	6.2
Others	12	13	21.8	30.2	25.6
Total	55	43	100.	100.	100.

As can be seen from Table IV, page 21 the most frequent offenses were larceny, running away, and breaking and entering and larceny, in that order. Among the offenses listed as "Others" only four occurred as often as twice, indecent assault and assault and battery by first offenders, shining shoes without a license and attempted robbery among the recidivists. All others occurred only once.

In an unpublished work still under study in the Boston Juvenile Court, research into reason for reference between 1938 and 1947 shows that of 5,218 offenses, larceny was committed by 1,755, second in order was violation of municipal ordinances, with 1,060. Breaking and entering was third in order with 702, runaways were fourth with 689. Thus it would seem that this study showed a definite agreement with the ten-year study in number of referrals in larceny and runaways and some agreement in the offense of breaking and entering. In this study the violation of municipal ordinances was not listed as such but as they appeared on the docket, for example:- receiving contributions on a public street, shining shoes without a license. If listed as violation of municipal ordinances this offense would have taken precedence over breaking and entering and larceny and thus would tend towards greater agreement with the ten year study.

In the Glueck study it was found

in the Boston Juvenile Court that in 71.1 per cent of

As can be seen from Table IV, page 21 the most frequent offenses were larceny, running away, and breaking and entering and larceny, in that order. Among the offenses listed as "Others" only four occurred as often as twice, indecent assault and assault and battery by first offenders, shining shoes without a license and attempted robbery among the recidivists. All others occurred only once.

In an unpublished work still under study in the Boston Juvenile Court, research into reason for reference between 1938 and 1947 shows that of 5,218 offenses, larceny was committed by 1,755, second in order was violation of municipal ordinances, with 1,060. Breaking and entering was third in order with 702, runaways were fourth with 689. Thus it would seem that this study shows a definite agreement with the ten-year study in number of referrals in larceny and runaways and some agreement in the offenses of breaking and entering. In this study the violation of municipal ordinances was not listed as such but as they appeared on the docket, for example:- receiving contributions on a public street, shining shoes without a license. If listed as violation of municipal ordinances this offense would have taken precedence over breaking and entering and larceny and thus would lend towards greater agreement with the ten year study.

In the Quack study it was found

in the Boston Juvenile Court that in 71.1 per cent of

> the cases the most characteristic offenses were against property; in 1.2 per cent, offenses against chastity; in 2.2 per cent, offenses against the public welfare, in 2 cases (2 per cent), crimes against the person. In 6.5 per cent of the cases no one type of anti-social behavior was predominant, two or more kinds of offenses appearing to be of equal weight in their early criminal careers. In 18.8 per cent of the cases the most frequent offenses were not classifiable in any of the above categories being of the kind typically designated as juvenile offenses--stubborness, malicious mischief, running away from home, school truancy and the like. [3]

The United States Childrens' Bureau[4] found that in 1935, in the reason for reference of boys to court that 42 per cent of boys appeared for stealing, 19 per cent for acts of carelessness or mischief, 10 per cent for traffic violation, with truancy and running away next in order. Kvaraceus [5] shows that 49 per cent of the boys referred to the Passaic Bureau were seen for reason of some sort of stealing.

Nearly every study of delinquency devotes some time to offenses and then, what is more important, to the reasons why such behavior takes place. At this point in this study, however, a comparison of recidivists and first offenders will be pointed up as shown in Table IV., page 21.

---

[3]Glueck, op. cit., p. 20.

[4]"Social Statistics," Juvenile Court Statistics, United States Children's Bureau, (Washington, D. C.: 1945), p. 11.

[5]William C. Kvaraceus, Juvenile Delinquency and the School (Yonkers on Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1945) Table 3, p. 35.

the cases the most characteristic offenses were against property; in 1.2 per cent, offenses against chastity; in 2.2 per cent, offenses against the public welfare, in 2 cases (2 per cent), crimes against the person. In 6.5 per cent of the cases no one type of anti-social behavior was predominant, two or more kinds of offenses appearing to be of equal weight in their early criminal careers. In 18.8 per cent of the cases the most frequent offenses were not classifiable in any of the above categories being of the kind typically designated as juvenile offenses--stubborness, malicious mischief, running away from home, school truancy and the like. [3]

The United States Children's Bureau[4] found that in 1938, in the reason for reference of boys to court that 42 per cent of boys appeared for stealing, 19 per cent for acts of carelessness or mischief, 10 per cent for traffic violation, with truancy and running away next in order. Ayrancosa [5] shows that 49 per cent of the boys referred to the Juvenile Bureau were seen for reason of some sort of stealing.

Nearly every study of delinquency devotes some time to offenses and then, what is more important, to the reasons why such behavior takes place. At this point in this study, however, a comparison of recidivists and first offenders will be pointed up as shown in Table IV., page 21.

---

[3]Glueck, op. cit., p. 20.

[4]"Social Statistics," Juvenile Court Statistics, United States Children's Bureau, (Washington, D. C.: 1945), p. 11.

[5]William C. Ayrancosa, Juvenile Delinquency and the School (Yonkers on Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1945) Table 3, p. 35.

If the numbers alone are considered in the offense of larceny, then no apparent difference is noted in a comparison of first offenders and recidivists. If the offense of breaking and entering and larceny are grouped together and called crimes against property, then numbers are the same for both groups. The percentages would differ somewhat. A smaller percentage of the first offenders seem to commit crimes against property. It is among the runaways that we seem to find observable differences, only seven recidivists being involved in this delinquency and twenty first offenders.

If would seem, therefore, that running away is committed to a greater extent by first offenders than by recidivists and crimes against property are more likely to be committed by recidivists. It might also be assumed that running away is less serious than larceny or breaking and entering. Miss Merrill[6] says however,

> In the interest of determining whether any particular type of offense is apt to be associated with recidivism, we have tabulated all of the known offenses for our 300 delinquents. There were 518 offenses of which we have record during the period of these observations. Of this total, 309 (59.7 per cent), were offenses against property. The next largest single category is being beyond parental control which includes 18.3 per cent of the offenses. Our purpose of comparing single offenders with recidivists to determine what percentage of the children who are brought in for each type of offense become repeated offenders is rendered invalid because there are too few cases in some of the catabories to make our comparison meaningful. The category which includes offenses against property (theft) can be broken down into two subcategories to afford a somewhat more detailed

---

[6]Maud A. Merrill, Problems of Child Delinquency (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company 1947) pp. 296-297.

If the numbers alone are considered in the offense of larceny, then no apparent difference is noted in a comparison of first offenders and recidivists. If the offenses of breaking and entering and larceny are grouped together and called crimes against property, then numbers are the same for both groups. The percentages would differ somewhat. A smaller percentage of the first offenders seem to commit crimes against property. It is among the runaways that we seem to find observable differences, only seven recidivists being involved in this delinquency and twenty first offenders.

It would seem, therefore, that running away is committed to a greater extent by first offenders than by recidivists and crimes against property are more likely to be committed by recidivists. It might also be assumed that running away is less serious than larceny or breaking and entering. Miss Merrill[6] says however,

> In the interest of determining whether any particular type of offense is apt to be associated with recidivism, we have tabulated all of the known offenses for our 300 delinquents. There were 718 offenses of which we have record during the period of this observations. Of this total, 309 (39.7 per cent), were offenses against property. The next largest single category is being beyond parental control which includes 18.3 per cent of the offenses. Our purpose of comparing single offenders with recidivists to determine what percentage of the children who are brought in for each type of offense become repeated offenders is hindered invalid because there are too few cases in some of the categories to make our comparison meaningful. The category which includes offenses against property (theft) can be broken down into two subcategories to afford a somewhat more detailed

---

[6] Maud A. Merrill, Problems of Child Delinquency (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company 1947) pp. 295-297.

> analysis. It is of interest to note that 40 per cent of the children brought in for stealing recidivate, as against 52 per cent of those whose offense is burglary, which involves breaking and entering. Of course, burglary is not necessarily a more serious offense than stealing. Taking $200 from a cash drawer of a store where a child works after school is stealing. Breaking into the neighborhood store through a locked screen door and taking lollypops is burglary. The burglary category is the only one in which the recidivists outnumber the single offenders. We found no significant difference between our single offenders and recidivists when they were compared on the basis of the type of court action in each case.

Thus it would seem that the type of offense might be used as a predictive factor in recidivism not alone based on the results of this study but also based on Miss Merrill's results.

IV. HOME AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD OF OFFENDERS

The Boston Juvenile Court is situated close to the heart of Boston's business, industrial, and entertainment areas. It is perhaps to be expected that many of its delinquents would develop from the dilapitated housing conditions to be found close by. In addition, the bright lights and attractions of commercialized entertainment magnetize the visiting runaway and the juvenile in search of adventure, thus attracting many boys from homes outside the city. The geographical situation of the offenders' homes is best illustrated by the following table and Table VI. on page 27.

analysis. It is of interest to note that 40 per cent of the children brought in for shoplifting recidivists, as against 32 per cent of those whose offense is burglary, which involves breaking and entering. Of course, burglary is not necessarily a more serious offense than stealing. Taking $200 from a cash drawer of a store where a child works after school is stealing. Breaking into the neighborhood store through a locked screen door and taking lollypops is burglary. The burglary category is the only one in which the recidivists outnumber the single offenders. We found no significant difference between our single offenders and recidivists when they were compared on the basis of the type of court action in each case.

Thus it would seem that the type of offense might be used as a predictive factor in recidivism not alone based on the results of this study but also based on Mike Merrill's results.

IV. HOME AREA OR NEIGHBORHOOD OF OFFENDERS

The Boston Juvenile Court is situated close to the heart of Boston's business, industrial, and entertainment areas. It is perhaps to be expected that many of its delinquents would develop from the dilapidated housing conditions to be found close by. In addition, the bright lights and attractions of commercialized entertainment magnetize the visiting runway and the juvenile in search of adventure, thus attracting many boys from homes outside the city. The geographical situation of the offenders' homes is best illustrated by the following table and Table VI. on page 27.

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO NEIGHBORHOOD

City Area	First Offenders		Recidivists		All	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Roxbury	7	12.9	10	23.	17	17.3
Greater Boston	10	18.1	5	11.6	15	15.3
South End	8	14.5	5	11.6	13	13.3
Other States	7	12.9	3	6.9	10	10.2
North End	4	7.2	5	11.6	9	9.2
West End	3	5.5	4	9.2	7	7.2
Charlestown	3	5.5	4	9.2	7	7.2
Massachusetts	5	9.0	1	2.2	6	6.1
South Boston	4	7.2	2	4.6	6	6.1
East Boston	1	1.8	3	6.9	4	4.1
Dorchester	1	1.8	1	2.2	2	2.0
Allston	1	1.8	0	0.	1	1.0
Brighton	1	1.8	0	0.	1	1.0
Total	55	100.	43	100.	98	100.

TABLE V

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO NEIGHBORHOOD

City Area	First Offenders		Recidivists		All	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Roxbury	7	12.9	10	22.	17	17.3
Greater Boston	10	18.1	5	11.6	15	15.3
South End	8	14.5	5	11.6	13	13.3
Other Areas	7	12.9	3	6.9	10	10.2
North End	4	7.2	5	11.6	9	9.2
West End	3	5.5	4	9.2	7	7.2
Charlestown	3	5.5	4	9.2	7	7.2
Massachusetts	5	9.0	1	2.2	6	6.1
South Boston	4	7.2	2	4.6	6	6.1
East Boston	1	1.8	3	6.9	4	4.1
Dorchester	1	1.8	1	2.2	2	2.0
Allston	1	1.8	0	0.	1	1.0
Brighton	1	1.8	0	0.	1	1.0
Total	55	100.	43	100.	98	100.

TABLE VI

TEN YEAR TOTAL OFFENDERS BY DISTRICTS

District	All	Male	Per Cent
Back Bay	86	67	1.48
West End	1,194	860	19.09
North End	782	566	12.56
South End	1,293	880	19.5
Charlestown	157	130	2.88
East Boston	173	141	3.1
Dorchester	309	197	4.37
South Boston	339	243	5.6
Roxbury	709	494	10.97
Brighton	51	35	.76
Jamaica Plain	60	39	.85
Roslindale	32	16	.34
West Roxbury	14	11	.23
Hyde Park	13	7	.14
Suburban Boston	652	360	7.99
Outside	917	457	10.14
Total	6,781	4,503	100.

TABLE VI

TEN YEAR TOTAL OFFENDERS BY DISTRICTS

District	All	Male	Per Cent
Back Bay	85	57	1.48
West End	1,184	850	19.09
North End	722	566	12.56
South End	1,293	880	19.5
Charlestown	157	130	2.84
East Boston	173	141	3.1
Dorchester	309	227	4.77
South Boston	272	243	4.8
Roxbury	709	494	13.97
Brighton	51	35	.76
Jamaica Plain	60	39	.85
Roslindale	32	16	.34
West Roxbury	14	11	.23
Hyde Park	13	7	.14
Suburban Boston	652	360	7.99
Outside	917	457	10.14
Total	6,781	4,504	100.

It will be noticed according to Table V. page 26 that a much larger percentage of first offenders come from Greater Boston, Massachusetts and other States. This, no doubt, is due to the number of runaways included in the first offenders. The recidivist group tends to agree to a greater extent with the ten-year study of the court in the percentage of offenders from the various districts, Table VI. page 27. The unusually large percentage of Roxbury offenders in this study is explained only by the fact that the Roxbury district is number four in the ten-year study and normally a large number of delinquents is expected from that area. In addition the members of one gang of boys were brought before the court during the year at various and subsequent times.

The literature on this subject of neighborhood or marginal areas is very similar in nature, nearly all authors quoting from Clifford R. Shaw [7] in his Chicago study.

> Shaw and his colleagues have shown rather conclusively that conduct symptomatic of predelinquency including habitual truancy, incipient delinquency, and the like, tends to be clustered or concentrated in certain well-defined areas. The highest ratios are usually found in the congested and disorganized urban sections lying adjacent to the central business and warehouse areas, and the lowest rates in the outlying suburban and residential districts. Dr. Shaw makes it quite plain that there is a definite relation between his delinquency areas and juvenile delinquency. Besides he demonstrates a serious relation between delinquency and recidivism. show that one area which has a high rate of delinquency has also a high percentage of recidivism

[7] Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

It will be noticed according to Table V, page 26 that a much larger percentage of first offenders come from Greater Boston, Massachusetts and other States. This, no doubt, is due to the number of runaways included in the first offenders. The recidivist group tends to agree to a greater extent with the ten-year study of the court in the percentage of offenders from the various districts, Table VI, page 27. The unusually large percentage of Roxbury offenders in this study is explained only by the fact that the Roxbury district is number four in the ten-year study and normally a large number of delinquents is expected from that area. In addition the members of one gang of boys were brought before the court during the year at various and subsequent times.

The literature on this subject of neighborhood or marginal areas is very similar in nature, nearly all authors quoting from Clifford R. Shaw [7] in his Chicago study.

> Shaw and his colleagues have shown rather conclusively that conduct symptomatic of predelinquency including habitual truancy, incipient delinquency, and the like, tendeto be clustered or concentrated in certain well-defined areas. The highest ratios are usually found in the congested and disorganized urban sections lying adjacent to the central business and warehouse areas, and the lowest rates in the outlying suburban and residential districts. Dr. Shaw makes it quite plain that there is a definite relation between his delinquency areas and juvenile delinquency. Besides he demonstrates a serious relation between delinquency and recidivism. Show that one area which has a high rate of delinquency has also a high percentage of recidivism

[7] Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

among the delinquents.[8]

> In 1894 Jane Addams was writing about "the subtle evils of inadequate and wretched housing." When you grope your way through dirty alleys and up rickety dark stairs and hallways, ever fearful of rats, into dark, barren cold rooms and face the sodden despair of parents whose morale has completely broken down and see the neglected, sick, dirty little children you think "can this be America?" And yet even in places like this, children still cling to those more intrinsic values of affection and security, which home means to them. 9

Miss Merrill[10] comparing a group of non-delinquents, or her control group, and a group of delinquents found

> Twenty-eight homes in a hundred were better than most of the homes in the same neighborhood in the control, only six in a hundred in the delinquent, whereas in this group thirty-five in a hundred were worse than most of the homes in the neighborhood, as against ten in a hundred in the control group.

Using this same type of comparison it is interesting to point out in the first offenders and recidivist groups in this study that a far greater percentage of first offenders than recidivists come from the outlying area of Boston and even outside of Boston. More than 60% of the recidivists lived within a heavily populated circle whose radii were no greater than one mile in length. While it is difficult to say that the homes in the outlying areas and outside of Boston are better than those in the center of the city, it is a fact that the homes in the center are more likely to be older and more dilapitated

---

[8]Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1947) p. 141.

[9]Jessie F. Binford, Postwar Problems of Youth (Washington, D.C.: Federal Probation, Oct. - Dec. 1947) Vol. XI, 4:9.

[10]Merrill, op. cit., p. 78.

among the delinquents.[8]

In 1894 Jane Addams was writing about "the subtle evils of inadequate and wretched housing." When you grope your way through dirty alleys and up rickety dark stairs and hallways, ever fearful of rats, into dark, barren cold rooms and face the sodden despair of parents whose morale has completely broken down and see the neglected, sick, dirty little children you think "can this be America?" And yet even in places like this, children still cling to those more intrinsic values of affection and security, which home means to them. [9]

Miss Merrill [10] comparing a group of non-delinquents, or her control group, and a group of delinquents found

Twenty-eight homes in a hundred were better than most of the homes in the same neighborhood in the control, only six in a hundred in the delinquent, whereas in this group thirty-five in a hundred were worse than most of the homes in the neighborhood, as against ten in a hundred in the control group.

Using this same type of comparison it is interesting to point out in the first offenders and recidivist groups in this study that a far greater percentage of first offenders than recidivists come from the outlying area of Boston and even outside of Boston. More than 60% of the recidivists lived within a heavily populated circle whose radii were no greater than one mile in length. While it is difficult to say that the homes in the outlying areas and outside of Boston are better than those in the center of the city, it is a fact that the homes in the center are more likely to be older and more dilapidated

---

[8] Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1947) p. 141.

[9] Jessie F. Binford, Postwar Problems of Youth (Washington, D.C.: Federal Probation, Oct. - Dec. 1947) Vol. XI, 4:9.

[10] Merrill, op. cit., p. 78.

than those in the other areas.

V. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF HOME

In this study attempted use was made of only two tools in judging the economic status of the homes of the boys in the two groups, (1) occupation of the father, (2) monthly rentals. Data were insufficient to judge whether the homes were comfortable, marginal or dependent unless occupation of the father should again be used as a standard of measurement.

Information as to the amount of rent or ownership of home was available in only thirty-nine of a total of ninety-eight cases, twenty-three of this thirty-nine were recidivists and only sixteen among the first offenders. Although these figures cannot be considered significant, it might be well to include them in the study. Seven of the recidivists' parents owned their own homes. One owned an eight-apartment building, one a three-family house. One of those who rented a home, rented two rooms. Eight first offenders' parents were home owners. One owned a two-family house and another rented the bottom floor. Six recidivists and three first offenders rented homes in the less than $20.00 per month class. In homes that rented from $21.00 to $30.00 there were four recidivists and three first offenders. Only one first offender and three recidivists lived in homes which rented from $31.00 to $40.00. One of each group lived in a home renting at $41.00 to $50.00 per month, one from the recidivist group in those renting from $51.00 to $60.00. The parents of one recidivist

than those in the other areas.

V. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF HOME

In this study attempted use was made of only two tools in judging the economic status of the homes of the boys in the two groups, (1) occupation of the father, (2) monthly rentals. Data were insufficient to judge whether the homes were comfortable, marginal or dependent unless occupation of the father should again be used as a standard of measurement.

Information as to the amount of rent or ownership of home was available in only thirty-nine of a total of ninety-eight cases, twenty-three of this thirty-nine were recidivists and only sixteen among the first offenders. Although these figures cannot be considered significant, it might be well to include them in the study. Seven of the recidivists' parents owned their own homes. One owned an eight-apartment building, one a three-family house. One of those who rented a home, rented two rooms. Eight first offenders' parents were home owners. One owned a two-family house and another rented the bottom floor. Six recidivists and three first offenders rented homes in the less than $20.00 per month class. In homes that rented from $21.00 to $30.00 there were four recidivists and three first offenders. Only one first offender and three recidivists lived in homes which rented from $31.00 to $40.00. One of each group lived in a home renting at $41.00 to $50.00 per month, one from the recidivist group in those renting from $51.00 to $60.00. The parents of one recidivist

also lived in a home in the $61.00 to $70.00 group. Monthly rentals as a gauge of economic status can be misleading however, as in the case of the one boy in the group who lived in a home in the $61.00 to $70.00 monthly rental. The actual rent here was $16.00 per week for three furnished rooms, the father was a $40.00 per week maintainance man in a theatre. The only cooking facility was a single electric hot-plate. Bed clothes were negligible, the court boy was found on one occasion dangerously sick, in cold weather, covered with a single sheet and his coat.

A comparison of the economic status of the offenders as indicated by the occupations of their fathers, is shown in Table VII. page 32.

alon lived in a home in the $61.00 to $70.00 group. Monthly rentals as a gauge of economic status can be misleading however, as in the case of the one boy in the group who lived in a home in the $61.00 to $70.00 monthly rental. The actual rent here was $16.00 per week for three furnished rooms, the father was a $30.00 per week maintenance man in a theatre. The only cooking facility was a single electric hot-plate. Bed clothes were negligible, the court boy was found on one occasion dangerously sick, in cold weather, covered with a single sheet and his coat.

A comparison of the economic status of the offenders as indicated by the occupations of their fathers, is shown in Table VII. page 32.

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONS OF FATHER

Occupational Group	Recidivists		First Offenders		Employed Males in U.S.
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	Per Cent
Professional	0	0	0	0	3.1
Semi-professional, managerial	1	2.33	0	0	5.2
Clerical, skilled trades, retail business	4	9.31	4	7.30	15.0
Rural owners, farming	0	0	0	0	15.3
Semi-skilled, minor clerical, business	13	30.21	13	24.10	30.6
Slightly skilled	7	16.28	9	16.40	11.3
Unskilled	6	13.95	8	15.50	19.5
Unclassified	3	6.98	7	13.00	0
Deserted	4	9.31	3	5.40	0
Unemployed	3	6.98	4	7.30	0
Deceased	2	4.65	6	11.00	0
Total	43	100.	55	100.	0

TABLE VII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO OCCUPATIONS OF FATHER

Occupational Group	Radiviste		First Offenders		Employed Males in U.S.
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	Per Cent
Professional	0	0	0	0	3.1
Semi-professional, managerial	1	2.33	0	0	5.2
Clerical, skilled trades, retail business	4	9.31	4	7.30	15.0
Rural owners, farming	0	0	0	0	15.3
Semi-skilled, minor clerical, business	13	30.21	13	24.10	30.6
Slightly skilled	7	16.28	9	16.40	11.3
Unskilled	6	13.95	8	15.50	19.5
Unclassified	3	6.98	7	13.00	0
Deserted	4	9.31	3	5.40	0
Unemployed	3	6.98	4	7.30	0
Deceased	2	4.65	6	11.00	0
Total	43	100.	55	100.	0

Most of the parents of both the recidivists and first offenders were classified in the lower occupational classification, Table VII., page 32. Unusual differences, however, are noted only in the deceased classification and in those listed as unclassified. Here it is probable that the impact of the loss of the father, or his lack of attention in supporting his family, resulted in court appearance in an already precariously adjusted individual.

Poverty in itself is not exactly a cause of delinquency but once again the individual reaction to poverty and the strains and tensions imposed by it frequently do result in producing factors most favorable to delinquency.

Burt [11] says

> If the majority of delinquents are needy, the majority of the needy do not become delinquent. Poverty can only engender crime by its ultimate action, through ways more often circuitous than plain, upon the inner mental life of the potential offender. Even where its influence seems comparatively straightforward and immediate, the poverty that counts is, as a rule, not absolute poverty, but relative poverty--the ratio of available means to irresistable desires and the relative poverty may be induced quite as much by extravagant wants as by an insufficient income.

From Banay [12]

> Lacking security, prestige and authority within the family, the individual seeks it outside, by identifying himself with a gang. Or in other cases, he merely imitates and participates in his own family's anti-social activities, learning from them

---

[11] Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent (London: University of London Press, 1938) p. 92.

[12] Ralph S. Banay, Youth in Despair (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1948) p. 44.

Most of the parents of both the recidivists and first offenders were classified in the lower occupational classification, Table VII., page 32. Unusual differences, however, are noted only in the deceased classification and in those listed as unclassified. Here it is probable that the impact of the loss of the father, or his lack of attachment in supporting his family, resulted in court appearance in an already measurably adjusted individual.

Poverty in itself is not exactly a cause of delinquency but once again the individual reaction to poverty and the strains and tensions imposed by it frequently do result in producing factors most favorable to delinquency.

Burt [11] says

> If the majority of delinquents are needy, the majority of the needy do not become delinquent. Poverty can only suggester crime by its ultimate action, through ways more often circuitous than plain, upon the inner mental life of the potential offender. Even where its influence seems comparatively straightforward and immediate, the poverty that counts is, as a rule, not absolute poverty, but relative poverty--the reality of available means to irrepressible desires and the relative poverty may be induced quite as much by extravagant wants as by an insufficient income.

From Healy [12]

> Leading security, prestige and authority within the family, the individual seeks it outside, by identifying himself with a gang. Or in other cases, he merely imitates and participates in his own family's anti-social activities, learning from them

---

[11] Cyril Burt, The Young Delinquent (London: University of London Press, 1938) p. 92.

[12] Ralph S. Healy, Youth in Danger (New York: Howard-McCann, Inc., 1948) p. 44.

> the techniques of stealing for example. The approbation and esteem of his fellow delinquents (within the family or within the gang) become vital to his social security. He may even view a career in crime as one that promises economic gain and other rewards -- another form of security.

It might be noted here that a greater percentage of the recidivists' fathers work in the lower income classification than do the fathers of the first offenders.

VI. SIZE AND POSITION OF OFFENDER IN FAMILY

Some observers express the view that size of family is not in itself a determining factor in delinquency. Others say that if a family is large enough it is more likely that one of them will be a delinquent. Still others feel that in large families the quality of discipline and guidance is affected.

the techniques of stealing for example. The approbation and esteem of his fellow delinquents (within the family or within the gang) become vital to his social security. He may even view a career in crime as one that promises economic gain and other rewards -- another form of security.

It might be noted here that a greater percentage of the reformatory fathers work in the lower income classification than do the fathers of the first offenders.

VI. SIZE AND POSITION OF OFFENDER IN FAMILY

Some observers express the view that size of family is not in itself a determining factor in delinquency. Others say that if a family is large enough it is more likely that one of them will be a delinquent. Still others feel that in large families the quality of discipline and guidance is affected.

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF FAMILY

No. of Children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 and Over	Avg.	Total
No. First Offenders	2	9	7	9	7	5	16	5.1	55
Per Cent	3.6	16.4	12.7	16.4	12.7	9.1	29.1	-	100.
No. of Recidivists	3	3	5	5	5	6	15	5.4	43
Per Cent	6.9	6.9	11.7	11.7	11.7	14.0	34.8	-	* 97.7

*One of recidivist group unclassified thus accounting for 2.3 per cent.

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO SIZE OF FAMILY

No. of Children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7 and Over	Ave.	Total
No. First Offenders	2	9	7	9	7	5	16	5.1	55
Per Cent	3.6	16.4	12.7	16.4	12.7	9.1	29.1	-	100.
No. of Recidivists	3		5	5	5	6	15	5.4	43
Per Cent	6.9	6.9	11.7	11.7	11.7	14.0	34.8	-	97.7

*One of recidivist group unclassified thus accounting for 2.3 per cent.

Like the Glueck[13] and Kvaraceus[14] studies, the offenders in this study were members of large families. As a matter of fact, the average in all three studies is five children per family. While the recidivists in this study tend to have slightly larger families than the first offenders, it seems more indicative of the two groups to note the areas of highest per cent in each group.

Family size is used by the Gluecks[15] as a predictive factor in judging possible success in correctional schools.

Position in family as a causative factor in delinquency does not appear in the literature on the subject as often as do the other factors in this study. It would seem, however, to be a contributory factor in causing jealousy, lack of adjustment and perhaps a feeling of insecurity among those families consisting of two or more children.

Miss Merrill[16] says

> The position of the boy in the family seems to be significant in our group, though I think the significance lies in the size of the family rather than in the fact that the delinquent is most often intermediate in a family of four or more children.

---

[13] Op. cit., p. 77.

[14] Op. cit., p. 79.

[15] Op. cit., p. 208.

[16] Op. cit., p. 76.

Like the Glueck[13] and Sayrooms[14] studies, the offenders in this study were members of large families. As a matter of fact, the average in all three studies is five children per family. While the residivists in this study tend to have slightly larger families than the first offenders, it seems more indicative of the two groups to note the areas of highest per cent in each group.

Family size is used by the Glueck[15] as a predictive factor in judging possible success in correctional schools.

Position in family as a causative factor in delinquency does not appear in the literature on the subject as often as do the other factors in this study. It would seem, however, to be a contributory factor in causing jealousy, lack of adjustment and perhaps a feeling of insecurity among those families consisting of two or more children.

Miss Merrill[16] says

> The position of the boy in the family seems to be significant in our group, though I think the significance lies in the size of the family rather than in the fact that the delinquent is most often intermediate in a family of four or more children.

---

[13] Op. cit., p. 77.

[14] Op. cit., p. 79.

[15] Op. cit., p. 208.

[16] Op. cit., p. 76.

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO POSITION IN FAMILY

Position in Family	Only Child	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th and Over	Total
No. First Offenders	2	12	10	5	11	4	3	8	55
Per Cent	3.6	21.8	18.1	9.1	20.0	7.3	5.5	9.1	100.
No. of Recidivists	3	7	8	5	7	2	3	4	43
Per Cent	6.9	16.4	18.5	11.6	16.4	4.7	6.9	9.3 *	90.7

*One of recidivist group unclassified thus accounting for 9.3 per cent.

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO POSITION IN FAMILY

Position in Family	Only Child	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th and Over	Total
No. First Offenders	2	12	10	5	11	4	3	8	55
Per Cent	3.6	21.8	18.1	9.1	20.0	7.3	5.5	9.1	100.
No. of Recidivists	1	7	8	5	7	2	3	4	43
Per Cent	6.3	16.4	18.5	11.6	16.4	4.7	6.9	9.3 *	90.7

*One of recidivist group unclassified thus accounting for 9.3 per cent.

Among first offenders in this study, the first born and the fourth would seem most likely to become court offenders. Third in order would be the second child. "Only" children seem least likely to get into difficulty with the law, Table IX., page 37.

The second born seem to appear in court most frequently among the recidivists, with an equal percentage of the first and fourth born, second in order. In this group the fifth born seems least likely to offend. If we combine both groups, first born seem get into trouble most often with "only children" least likely to come before the court.

While these figures seem to confirm the hypothesis that parents of large families cannot give the intensive guidance which children need, to all children in their families, only slightly more than 11 per cent of all children in Massachusetts are "only children" according to the United States Statistical Abstract for 1946.[17]

VII. TRUANCY - SCHOOL RETARDATION

Members of these groups were considered truants whether chronic, frequent or occasional truants. Those who had committed truancy only once or twice over a long period of school attendance were considered regular in attendance.

Retardation was based on the norms established in the Stan-

---

[17] United States Statistical Abstract for 1946 (Washington, D. C.,: United States Department of Commerce, 1946), p. 52.

Among first offenders in this study, the first born and the fourth would seem most likely to become court offenders. Third in order would be the second child. "Only" children seem least likely to get into difficulty with the law, Table IX., page 37.

The second born seem to appear in court most frequently among the recidivists, with an equal percentage of the first and fourth born, second in order. In this group the fifth born seems least likely to offend. If we combine both groups, first born seem get into trouble most often with "only children" least likely to come before the court.

While these figures seem to confirm the hypothesis that parents of large families cannot give the intensive guidance which children need, to all children in their families, only slightly more than 11 per cent of all children in Massachusetts are "only children" according to the United States Statistical Abstract for 1946.[17]

VII. TRUANCY - SCHOOL RETARDATION

Members of these groups were considered truants whether chronic, frequent or occasional truants. Those who had committed truancy only once or twice over a long period of school attendance were considered regular in attendance.

Retardation was based on the norms established in the Stan-

---

[17] United States Statistical Abstract for 1946 (Washington, D. C.): United States Department of Commerce, 1946), p. 52.

ford Achievement Test. A fourteen year old child, according to these norms, should be in the ninth grade.

Ford Achievement Test. A fourteen year old child, according to these norms, should be in the ninth grade.

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO TRUANCY AND RETARDATION

	Per Cent Truants	Per Cent Below Grade Norms	Mean Age	Per Cent in Special Class	Per Cent No Record of Grade Placement
Recidivists	39.5	65	14-4-18	18.6	11.6
First Offenders	25.45	56.3	14-0-27	12.7	12.7

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO TRUANCY AND RETARDATION

	Per Cent Truants	Per Cent Below Grade Norms	Mean Age	Per Cent in Special Class	Per Cent No Record of Grade Placement
Retardates	39.5	65	14-4-18	18.6	11.6
Fluent Offenders	25.45	56.3	14-0-27	12.7	12.7

It must be remembered that both these groups are court offenders. Thus the difference between the groups ~~are~~ is not expected to be as great as that between delinquents and the usual control. The factors of truancy and school retardation seem to show the most unusual difference thus far noted between the recidivists and the first offenders, as seen in Table X., page 40.

In other similar studies the percentage of truancy has been found to vary from 25 per cent of the delinquents in Brockton, Mass.[18] to 83 per cent in a London[19] study of 276 delinquents.

The delinquents studied by the Gluecks[20] in the Boston Juvenile Court and referred to the Judge Baker Foundation were found 6.4 per cent truant. Quoting from the same paragraph of the Glueck book,

> Even more significant perhaps, than the limited schooling of the group is the fact that so many of the boys were behind grade for their age. Only 15 per cent were not retarded in school and, if a retardation of one year is not to be considered serious, we can add to this figure 23 per cent more making a total of only 38 per cent who were not more than one year behind class for their age and leaving 62 per cent who were two or more years behind grade.---13 per cent of them being definitely

---

[18] Edwin A. Nelson, "Prevailing Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in Brockton, Massachusetts" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University, Boston, 1940) p. 64.

[19] A.M.Carr-Saunders, H. Mannhein, and E. C. Rhodes, An Enquiry into Juvenile Delinquency (Cambridge, England, The University Press, 1942) p. 86.

[20] Op. cit., p. 11.

It must be remembered that both these groups are court offenders. Thus the difference between the groups are not expected to be as great as that between delinquents and the usual control. The factors of truancy and school retardation seem to show the most usual difference this for noted between the individuals and the first offenders, as seen in Table X., page 40.

In other similar studies the percentage of truancy has been found to vary from 25 per cent of the delinquents in Brockton, Mass.,[18] to 83 per cent in a London[19] study of 276 delinquents.

The delinquents studied by the Glueccks[20] in the Boston Juvenile Court and referred to the Judge Baker Foundation were found 6.1 per cent truant. Quoting from the same paragraph of the Glueck book,

> Even more significant perhaps, than the limited schooling of the group is the fact that so many of the boys were behind grade for their age. Only 15 per cent were not retarded in school and, if a retardation of one year is not to be considered serious, we can add to this figure 23 per cent more making a total of only 38 per cent who were not more than one year behind class for their age and leaving 62 per cent who were two or more years behind grade.---13 per cent of them being definitely

---

[18] Edwin A. Nelson, "Prevailing Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in Brockton, Massachusetts" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University, Boston, 1932) p. 64.

[19] A.M. Carr-Saunders, H. Mannheim, and E. C. Rhodes, in Society into Juvenile Delinquency (London: Kegan and, the University Press, 1932) p. 36.

[20] Op. cit., p. 12.

> feebleminded. In Philadelphia [21] a study of truants concluded that almost one-fourth of the truant children were retarded in school. 22

The great variance in percentages both in truancy and retardation may perhaps be due to the interpretation placed on these phases of the studies by their authors. This is not too important, what is significant is the relatively greater number of delinquents and recidivists who are retarded and truant when compared with the control and first offender groups.

VIII. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Most of the literature on the subject of delinquency includes some discussion of religion as pertaining to delinquency. Most authors, while pointing to the high incidence of delinquency in certain denominations in those areas in which the studies are undertaken, seem to hesitate to indicate that any one denomination per se tends to contribute to delinquency. Barnes and Teeters [23] for instance say,

> Studies by two distinguished European criminologists, Aschaffenburg and Bonger, show that Catholics tend to be more criminal than Protestants and that Jews are the least criminal of the three groups. Such generalization must be accepted guardedly, for other factors are always present in attempting to evaluate the criminality of large

---

[21] John Otto Reineman, "The Truant Before the Court" Federal Probation, September 1948), p. 11.

[22] Op. cit., p. 11.

[23] Op. cit., p. 222.

> feebleminded. In Philadelphia[21] a study of truants concluded that almost one-fourth of the truant children were retarded in school. 22

The great variance in percentages both in truancy and retardation may perhaps be due to the interpretation placed on these phases of the studies by their authors. This is not too important, what is significant is the relatively greater number of delinquents and individuals who are retarded and truant when compared with the control and first offender groups.

VIII. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Most of the literature on the subject of delinquency includes some discussion of religion as pertaining to delinquency. Most authors, while pointing to the high incidence of delinquency in certain denominations in those areas in which the studies are undertaken, seem to hesitate to indicate that any one denomination per se tends to contribute to delinquency. Barnes and Teeters[23] for instance say,

> studies by two distinguished European criminologists, Aschaffenburg and Bonger, show that Catholics tend to be more criminal than Protestants and that Jews are the least criminal of the three groups. Such generalization must be accepted guardedly, for other factors are always present in attempting to evaluate the criminality of large

---

[21] John Otto Reinemann, "The Truant Before the Court" Federal Probation, September 1948, p. 11.

[22] Op. cit., p. 11.

[23] Op. cit., p. 222.

groups of individuals. In many countries, where economic conditions are poorest, the dominant religion is Catholic. Hence, since most convicts come from low economic levels, Catholics tend to show unfavorably in the crime statistics.

groups of individuals. In many countries, where economic conditions are poorest, the dominant religion is Catholic. Hence, since most convicts come from low economic levels, Catholics tend to show unfavorably in the crime statistics.

TABLE XI

TABLE

DISTRIBUTION
ACCORDING TO RELI-

RELIGION	CATHOLIC		JEWISH	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
First Offenders	27	49.	0	0
Recidivists	37	86.	0	0
City of Boston *	308,512	59.3	118,000	22.7

*Figures on City of Boston from "Religious Bodies", Vol. I, pp. 466-467.

XI

OF OFFENDERS
GIOUS AFFILIATION

PROTESTANT		OTHER		NO RECORD		TOTAL	
No.	Per cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
23	41.8	1	1.8	4	7.4	55	100.
5	11.6	1	2.4	0	0	43	100.
89,815	17.2	4,391	.8	0	0	520,708	100.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census

XI

OF OFFENDERS
GIOUS AFFILIATION

PROTESTANT		CHURCH		NO RESPONSE		TOTAL	
No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
23	41.8	1	1.8	4	7.4	55	100.
5	71.6	1	2.4	0	0	41	100.
89,319	17.2	4,301	.8	0	0	520,708	100.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census

While it appears that a very unusual difference is noted in the comparison of the offenders in this study as to religion (Table XI, page 44) it would seem that these points must be given consideration (1) a greater percentage of those who consider themselves Catholics must be considered as churchgoers than of the other religions represented, since the Catholic tradition demands regular attendance; (2) a high percentage of the total group are runaways thus making a poor basis for comparison, since they are from outside Boston and thus might not be included in the total figures; and (3) Boston has more Catholics than any other denomination.

In the absence of recent reliable figures, however, a comparion cannot be made with total population figures. The statistics involving churchgoers from the Bureau of Census, form a reliable basis of comparison. Were it not for the extremely small percentage of Jewish delinquents found in previous studies, the complete absence of Jewish boys in this study might be more astounding. In addition Boston is fortunate in having an extremely active and affective Jewish movement, with regard to juvenile delinquency.

IX. GROUP AFFILIATION

The concensus of the literature on this subject seems to say that, while organized group affiliations per se have little or no effectiveness in the preventing of delinquency, because of the

While it appears that a very unusual difference is noted in the comparison of the offenders in this study as to religion (Table XI, page 44) it would seem that these points must be given consideration (1) a greater percentage of those who consider themselves Catholics must be considered as churchgoers than of the other religions represented, since the Catholic tradition demands regular attendance; (2) a high percentage of the total group are runaways thus making a poor basis for comparison, since they are from outside Boston and thus might not be included in the total figures; and (3) Boston has more Catholics than any other denomination.

In the absence of recent reliable figures, however, a comparison cannot be made with total population figures. The statistics involving churchgoers from the Bureau of Census, form a reliable basis of comparison. Were it not for the extremely small percentage of Jewish delinquents found in previous studies, the complete absence of Jewish boys in this study might be more astounding. In addition Boston is fortunate in having an extremely active and effective Jewish movement, with regard to juvenile delinquency.

IX. GROUP AFFILIATION

The concensus of the literature on this subject seems to say that, while organized group affiliations per se have little or no effectiveness in the prevention of delinquency, because of the

time spent in organized activities and the physical exhaustion resulting, and the functions such as recreation, health, service, and vocational placement, that crime prevention might well be regarded as a function incidental to this service.

time spent in organized activities and the physical education re-
sulting, and the functions such as recreation, health, service, and
vocational placement, that crime prevention might well be regarded
as a function incidental to this service.

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO GROUP (CLUB) MEMBERSHIP IN 1946

Membership Classification	Now Members		Former Members		Never Members		Members Unorganized Group		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
First Offenders	24	43.6	12	21.8	15	27.3	4	7.3	55	100.
Recidivists	* 22	51.1	7	16.3	11	25.6	7	16.3	(47) 43	(109.3) 100.

*Four offenders who were active club members also members of unorganized groups.

TABLE XII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO GROUP (CLUB) MEMBERSHIP IN 1946

Membership Classification	Now Members		Former Members		Never Members		Members Unorganized Group		Total	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
First Offenders Added-	24	43.6	12	21.8	15	27.3	4	7.3	55	100.
Repeat-	* 22	51.1	7	16.3	11	25.6	7	16.3	(47) 43	(109.3) 100.

*Four offenders who were active club members also members of unorganized groups.

No unusual differences seem apparent between the divisions of this group, as to group affiliation, until we consider the membership in unorganized groups. Although only 7 per cent of the first offenders are members of unorganized groups or gangs, more than 16 per cent of the recidivists belong to this category, (Table XII., page 47). This significance dwindles somewhat because of the small number of offenders in each division of this category.

With regard to group affiliation this study differs greatly from those studies made prior to this time. The Gluecks [24] for instance, found that 75 per cent of their delinquents had never belonged to any organizations or clubs. Kvaraceus [25] on the other hand found only 8 per cent of the delinquent child population holding membership, while 40 per cent of all Passaic children held like membership.

This study finds that 43.6 per cent of the first offenders and 51.1 per cent of the recidivists are members of organized groups. This more closely approaches the "all Passiac children" group of the Kvaraceus study. It is very probable, that since the Glueck study, Boys' Club activities have increased their recruiting and propagandizing to a great extent and that many more boys are now members of organized clubs.

---

[24] Op. cit., p. 12.

[25] Op. cit., p. 119.

No unusual differences seem apparent between the divisions of this group, as to group affiliation, until we consider the membership in unorganized groups. Although only 7 per cent of the first offenders are members of unorganized groups or gangs, more than 16 per cent of the recidivists belong to this category, (Table XII., page 47). This significance doubtless somewhat because of the small number of offenders in each division of this category.

With regard to group affiliation this study differs greatly from those studies made prior to this time. The Glueccks [24] for instance, found that 75 per cent of their delinquents had never belonged to any organizations or clubs. Ayarsons [25] on the other hand found only 8 per cent of the delinquent child population holding membership, while 40 per cent of all Passaic children held like membership.

This study finds that 43.6 per cent of the first offenders and 51.1 per cent of the recidivists are members of organized groups. This more closely approaches the "all Passaic children" group of the Ayarsons study. It is very probable, that since the Glueck study, Boys' Club activities have increased their recruiting and propagandizing to a great extent and that many more boys are now members of organized clubs.

---

[24] Op. cit., p. 12.

[25] Op. cit., p. 119.

X. GREGARIOUSNESS OF OFFENDERS

While the title of this factor would seem to imply the same sort of psychological impetus as that treated in the previous factor, the implications are very dissimilar. The club affiliation has association with an organized group whereas the sort of gregariousness treated here is unorganized gang association.

X. GREGARIOUSNESS OF OFFENDERS

While the title of this factor would seem to imply the same sort of psychological impetus as that treated in the previous factor, the implications are very dissimilar. The club affiliation has association with an organized group whereas the sort of gregariousness treated here is unorganized gang association.

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF COMPANIONS
AT TIME OF OFFENSE IN 1946

Number of Companions	First Offenders		Recidivists		All	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Alone	17	30.9	6	13.9	23	23.5
One	22	40.	22	51.2	44	44.9
Two	9	16.4	0	0	9	9.2
Three	4	7.3	11	25.6	15	15.3
Over Three	3	5.4	4	9.3	7	7.1
Total	55	100.	43	100.	98	100.

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDERS
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF CONVICTIONS
AT TIME OF OFFENSE IN 1946

Number of Convictions	First Offenders		Recidivists		All	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Alone	17	30.9	6	13.9	23	23.5
One	22	40.	22	51.2	44	44.9
Two	9	16.4	0	0	9	9.2
Three	4	7.3	11	25.6	15	15.3
Over Three	3	5.4	4	9.3	7	7.1
Total	55	100.	43	100.	98	100.

Most of the offenders in this group (Table XIII., page 50) tend to have one companion. The largest percentage in both recidivist and first offender divisions belong in that category. First offenders are alone in their delinquencies more frequently than recidivists. This is perhaps due to the fact that more than 36 per cent of first offenders were runaways, and that this type of offender, more often than not, is alone. The recidivists have a greater tendency to belong to larger groups of boys or gangs in the commission of their offenses. Recidivists have a greater percentage of delinquencies attributed to offenses against property. This may be accounted for by the desire to seek companionship in greater degree since help is usually necessary in the commission of an offense of this kind. More than 76 per cent of all offenders tend to seek companionship in the offenses for which they were brought to court.

This study compares favorably with other, larger and more extensive studies in the percentage of boys who seek companionship in committing their delinquencies. While the Gluecks [26] found that 30 per cent of the boys in their study committed their offenses without accomplices, this study and Kvaraceus [27] note only slightly more than 23 per cent in the same category.

The greatest difference between this and other studies of a like nature in the category of gregariousness occurs in the number

---

[26] Op. cit., p. 12.

[27] Op. cit., p. 115.

Boston University
School of Education

Most of the offenders in this group (Table XIII., page 50) tend to have one companion. The largest percentage in both recidivist and first offender divisions belong in that category. First offenders are alone in their delinquencies more frequently than recidivists. This is perhaps due to the fact that more than 36 per cent of first offenders were runaways, and that this type of offender, more often than not, is alone. The recidivists have a greater tendency to belong to larger groups of boys or gangs in the commission of their offenses. Recidivists have a greater percentage of delinquencies attributed to offenses against property. This may be accounted for by the desire to seek companionship in greater degree since help is usually necessary in the commission of an offense of this kind. More than 76 per cent of all offenders tend to seek companionship in the offenses for which they were brought to court.

This study compares favorably with other, larger and more extensive studies in the percentage of boys who seek companionship in committing their delinquencies. While the Glueck[26] found that 30 per cent of the boys in their study committed their offenses without accomplices, this study and Kvaraceus[27] note only slightly more than 23 per cent in the same category.

The greatest difference between this and other studies of a like nature in the category of gregariousness occurs in the number

---

[26] Op. cit., p. 12.

[27] Op. cit., p. 115.

of offenders who chose only one companion. This study finds that 40 per cent of the first offenders, more than 51 per cent of the recidivists and nearly 45 per cent of the entire group,had one accomplice. This, in some measure, may be explained by the rather small number of offenders contained in the study. We feel also that it may be due to the extreme youthfulness of the offenders and the fact that most of these boys, in the process of emerging from the narcissistic phase to the gang or group phase of life, tend at first to seek a lone companion.

of offenders who chose only one companion. This study finds that 40 per cent of the first offenders, more than 31 per cent of the recidivists and nearly 45 per cent of the entire group,had one accomplice. This, in some measure, may be explained by the rather small number of offenders contained in the study. We feel also that it may be due to the extreme youthfulness of the offenders and the fact that most of these boys, in the process of escaping from the narcissistic phase to the gang or group phase of life, tend at first to seek a lone companion.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

I. SUMMARY

The following statements tend to summarize briefly the findings in this study.

1. The sharp increase in number of court offenders between ages thirteen and fifteen is due to first offenders.

2. Recidivists commit their first offense at a much younger age than first offenders.

3. The most frequent offenses are running away, and those committed against property.

4. Most recidivists live in the city proper. Most first offenders come from outside of Boston.

5. First offenders come from homes slightly better economically than the recidivists.

6. The families of recidivists are slightly larger than those of the first offenders.

7. The first two children born into families of this study are more likely to become court offenders than those born later.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY AND NEED FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

I. SUMMARY

The following statements tend to summarize briefly the findings in this study.

1. The sharp increase in number of court offenders between ages thirteen and fifteen is due to first offenders.

2. Recidivists commit their first offense at a much younger age than first offenders.

3. The most frequent offenses are running away, and those committed against property.

4. Most recidivists live in the city proper. Most first offenders come from outside of Boston.

5. First offenders come from homes slightly better economically than the recidivists.

6. The families of recidivists are slightly larger than those of the first offenders.

7. The first two children born into families of this study are more likely to become court offenders than those born later.

8. Recidivists are more likely to be truant and to be retarded in school than the first offenders.

9. Those who call themselves Catholic are more likely to be delinquent than those who are considered to be members of other religious bodies.

10. Recidivists in this study show more likelihood to belong either to an organized club or to an unorganized group, than the first offenders.

11. First offenders tend to be alone in the commission of their offenses to a greater extent than the recidivists.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Age. It would seem very definitely that the sharp increase in number of court offenders between age thirteen and fifteen is due to first offenders. This study found that more than 56 per cent of its entire group were single offenders. The drastic jump at this time may be attributed to many factors, chief among which are, emergence into adolescence, a desire for adventure, a greater demand for recognition, a compulsion to seek companionship.

Recidivists commit their first offense at an average age which is nearly three years younger than the average of the first offenders, at least one appeared in court for the first time shortly after his eighth birthday. One would tend to conclude on the evidence, thus far presented, that at least among the recidivists group, habits

8. Recidivists are more likely to be truant and to be retarded in school than the first offenders.

9. Those who call themselves Catholic are more likely to be delinquent than those who are considered to be members of other religious bodies.

10. Recidivists in this study show more likelihood to belong either to an organized club or to an unorganized group, than the first offenders.

11. First offenders tend to be alone in the commission of their offenses to a greater extent than the recidivists.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Age. It would seem very definitely that the sharp increase in number of court offenders between age thirteen and fifteen is due to first offenders. This study found that more than 50 per cent of the entire group were single offenders. The drastic jump at this time may be attributed to many factors, chief among which are, emergence into adolescence, a desire for adventure, a greater demand for recognition, a compulsion to seek companionship.

Recidivists commit their first offense at an average age which is nearly three years younger than the average of the first offenders, at least one appeared in court for the first time shortly after his eighth birthday. One would tend to conclude on the evidence, thus far presented, that at least among the recidivists group, habits

leading to delinquency and court appearance are formed in many cases prior to attendance at school. One would be led to believe that preventative guidance is absent or of poor quality in the homes, neighborhood, and even the schools of those offenders who appear before the court. Most of the offenders, particularly the recidivists, were too young at the time of first offense to have had guidance in clubs or group agencies.

Offenses. The greater percentage of offenses were those committed against property and running away. Education which would lead boys to a respect for the property of others and an increased ability to stand up to and face their problems would seem to be indicated.

Neighborhood. It was found in this study that, while most first offenders came from outside Boston, more than 60 per cent of the recidivists live within a one mile radius of the center of the city. The highest percentage of recidivists and total offenders came from the Roxbury district. Most multiple offenders come from those congested areas which are part residental and part business. This would suggest a relationship between these marginal areas and recidivism. Apparently preventative guidance should focus attention on the congested areas of the city, with special emphasis on the Roxbury district. It would also be rather interesting to check on the cities and towns from which our runaways come, in order to discover whether the school systems sponsor a

leading to delinquency and court appearance are formed in many cases prior to attendance at school. One would be led to believe that preventative guidance is absent or of poor quality in the homes, neighborhood, and even the schools of those offenders who appear before the court. Most of the offenders, particularly the recidivists, were too young at the time of first offense to have had guidance in clubs or group agencies.

Offenses. The greater percentage of offenses were those committed against property and running away. Education which would lead boys to a respect for the property of others and an increased ability to stand up to and face their problems would seem to be indicated.

Neighborhood. It was found in this study that, while most first offenders came from outside Boston, more than 60 per cent of the recidivists live within a one mile radius of the center of the city. The highest percentage of recidivists and total offenders came from the Roxbury district. Most multiple offenders come from those congested areas which are part residential and part business. This would suggest a relationship between these marginal areas and recidivism. Apparently preventative guidance should focus attention on the congested areas of the city, with special emphasis on the Roxbury district. It would also be rather interesting to check on the cities and towns from which our runaways come, in order to discover whether the school systems appear a

guidance program and, if so, if the problem areas which bother these boys are given attention.

Economic Conditions. Differences between the groups are not especially unusual when economic conditions of the home are considered. From the figures provided by the study, however, it may be stated as a general condition that the first offenders come from homes slightly better economically than those of the recidivists. While both first offenders and recidivists come from families which average more than five children per family, the recidivists families are slightly larger than those of the first offenders. It would be natural to assume that as the third, fourth, and fifth child is born into the family they are receptive of less and less guidance than the first two. Yet this study would seem to show that the first two are most likely to get into difficulty with the law. More than 39 per cent of all offenders are first born and more than 36 per cent of all offenders are born second in their families. Thus it would appear that the parents of these families are negligent in providing guidance until the difficulties of the first born urges them to provide proper guidance for those born later.

Truancy, school retardation. The most apparent differences between the two group in this study seems to lie in truancy and school retardation. Fewer first offenders were truants. Nearly 10 per cent of the first offenders were below the grade norm for their age, and almost 6 per cent more recidivists were in special classes. Since this and all studies of this nature show a large percentage of

guidance program and, if so, if the problem areas which bother these boys are given attention.

Economic Conditions. Differences between the groups are not especially unusual when economic conditions of the home are considered. From the figures provided by the study, however, it may be stated as a general condition that the first offenders come from homes slightly better economically than those of the recidivists. While both first offenders and recidivists come from families which average more than five children per family, the recidivists families are slightly larger than those of the first offenders. It would be natural to assume that as the third, fourth, and fifth child is born into the family they are receptive of less and less guidance than the first two. Yet this study would seem to show that the first two are most likely to get into difficulty with the law. More than 39 per cent of all offenders are first born and more than 36 per cent of all offenders are born second in their families. Thus it would appear that the parents of these families are negligent in providing guidance until the difficulties of the first born urges them to provide proper guidance for those born later.

Truancy, school retardation. The most apparent differences between the two group in this study seems to lie in truancy and school retardation. Fewer first offenders were truants. Nearly 10 per cent of the first offenders were below the grade norm for their age, and almost 6 per cent more recidivists were in special classes. Since this and all studies of this nature show a large percentage of

truancy and retardation among delinquents, it would seem safe to conclude that greater dissatisfaction in school exists among multiple offenders or delinquents than among the single offenders or the control group. Guidance in the very first grade has already been recommended, because of the extreme youth of some offenders. The question is bound to arise, what sort of guidance is suitable for children of the first grade level.

Mr. John P. Maloney, principal of the Thomas N. Hart School District in South Boston, Mass., is now conducting a unique experiment with elementary school children which would seem to provide the answer to this question.

His theory is that much of the truancy and school dissatisfaction which manifests itself in adolescence is due to lack of adjustment and frustration in the elementary schools but especially in the first grade. He arrived at this conclusion when, as a junior high school teacher, he attempted to discover why children were coming to the seventh, eighth and ninth grades unprepared in mathematics and reading. His search led him back to the first grade. He found children being promoted to the second grade unprepared for the new grade or not being promoted because of their lack of preparation. As principal, first of the Quincy district, and now of the Thomas N. Hart district, Mr. Maloney has employed a unique method using an abacus, microphones, loud speakers and teaching fractions up to sixths in ending the first school year. With expert teaching, unusually bright children can accomplish double the work required of them.

truancy and retardation among delinquents, it would seem safe to conclude that greater dissatisfaction in school exists among multiple offenders or delinquents than among the single offenders or the control group. Guidance in the very first grade has already been recommended, because of the extreme youth of some offenders. The question is bound to arise, what sort of guidance is suitable for children of the first grade level.

Mr. John P. Maloney, principal of the Thomas N. Hart School District in South Boston, Mass., is now conducting a unique experiment with elementary school children which would seem to provide the answer to this question.

His theory is that much of the truancy and school dissatisfaction which manifests itself in adolescence is due to lack of adjustment and frustration in the elementary schools but especially in the first grade. He arrived at this conclusion when, as a junior high school teacher, he attempted to discover why children were coming to the seventh, eighth and ninth grades unprepared in mathematics and reading. His search led him back to the first grade. He found children being promoted to the second grade unprepared for the new grade or not being promoted because of their lack of preparation. As principal, first of the Quincy district, and now of the Thomas N. Hart district, Mr. Maloney has employed a unique method using an abacus, microphones, loud speakers and teaching fractions up to sixths in ending the first school year. With expert teaching, unusually bright children can accomplish double the work required of them.

This has resulted in the children being able to read fluently in second and third grade readers, at the end of the first grade, and glibly using figures running into the millions. To the knowledge of this study, no follow up has been undertaken as yet in this experiment. It is the opinion of this study that it will reveal a greatly reduced truancy and dissatisfaction record in the school experiences of these fortunate children. Education of this kind is guidance at its best since it eliminates some of the sources of delinquency at the very roots.

Religion. This study tends to show a higher percentage of Catholics than of other religions among our delinquent groups. This is particularly evident among the recidivists. In order to cope with this situation the Catholic Archbishop of Boston has recently appointed a court chaplain for each court dealing with juveniles within the archdioces. In addition he has established the Catholic Boys' Guidance Center to treat especially problem and delinquent boys.

Club affiliation. Recidivists, according to this study, tend to be more gregarious than first offenders. A greater percentage of recidicists belong to both organized and unorganized groups or gangs. It would seem, therefore, that a boy may hold membership in organized groups and yet not participate in those activities which might provide guidance of a preventative nature. Apparently these group agencies, per se, do not act as preventatives with the exception that time spent by incipient delinquents in organized group activities is time that might well be spent in delinquent pursuits were it not for

This has resulted in the children being able to read fluently in second and third grade readers, at the end of the first grade, and ability using figures running into the millions. To the knowledge of this study, no follow up has been undertaken as yet in this experiment. It is the opinion of this study that it will reveal a greatly reduced truancy and dissatisfaction record in the school experiences of these fortunate children. Education of this kind is guidance at its best since it eliminates some of the sources of delinquency at the very roots.

Religion. This study tends to show a higher percentage of Catholics than of other religions among our delinquent groups. This is particularly evident among the recidivists. In order to cope with this situation the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston has recently appointed a court chaplain for each court dealing with juveniles within the archdiocese. In addition he has established the Catholic Boys' Guidance Center to treat especially problem and delinquent boys.

Club affiliation. Recidivists, according to this study, tend to be more gregarious than first offenders. A greater percentage of recidivists belong to both organized and unorganized groups or gangs. It would seem, therefore, that a boy may hold membership in organized groups and yet not participate in those activities which might provide guidance of a preventative nature. Apparently these group agencies, per se, do not act as preventatives with the exception that time spent by incipient delinquents in organized group activities is time that might well be spent in delinquent pursuits were it not for

these agencies.

Companionship in delinquencies. Most boys choose to have a companion in committing their delinquencies. The recidivist group, once again, show a greater tendency toward gregariousness in that less than 41 per cent are alone in their delinquencies, whereas, more than 30 per cent of the first offenders commit offenses unaccompanied. Athletics, as a method of guidance, might be used here for preventative purposes; team athletics for the gregarious boy, individual type athletics for the fellow who tends to act alone. Some difficult has been encountered at times in interesting the delinquent boy in group athletics but this study would like to differentiate between group athletics, as sponsored by boy agencies, and team athletics, as found in the football and baseball activities of the Park Department and C. Y. O. leagues. The team type of athletics may very well tend to satisfy the desire to belong to a group and at the same time provide an outlet for the energies of adolescence. The group type athletics, however, seem to arouse increased resentment in boys who have already shown dissatisfaction in regimentation.

Guidance recommendations.

1. Home, neighborhood, and school must be made guidance conscious if early delinquency is to be reduced.

2. Boys must be educated to have a respect for property and to stand up to and face their problems. This can be accomplished through guidance, group or individual.

3. Guidance of a preventative nature should be focused

these agencies.

Communication in delinquencies. Most boys choose to have a companion in committing their delinquencies. The recidivist group, once again, show a greater tendency toward preparedness in that less than 41 per cent are alone in their delinquencies, whereas, more than 90 per cent of the first offenders commit offenses unaccompanied. Athletics, as a method of guidance, might be used here for preventative purposes; team athletics for the gregarious boy, individual type athletics for the fellow who tends to act alone. Some difficulty has been encountered at times in interesting the delinquent boy in group athletics but this study would like to differentiate between group athletics, as sponsored by boy agencies, and team athletics, as found in the football and baseball activities of the Park Department and Y. C. C. leagues. The team type of athletics may very well tend to satisfy the desire to belong to a group and at the same time provide an outlet for the energies of adolescence. The group type athletics, however, seem to arouse increased resentment in boys who have already shown dissatisfaction in reformentation.

Guidance recommendations.

1. Home, neighborhood, and school must be made guidance conscious if early delinquency is to be reduced.
2. Boys must be educated to have a respect for property and to stand up to and face their problems. This can be accomplished through guidance, group or individual.
3. Guidance of a preventative nature should be focused

on the congested and marginal areas of the city, with special emphasis on the Roxbury district.

4. Parents should be advised to be particularly watchful of the outside activities of the first two children born. These children should not be made conscious of any particular attentions given those born later.

5. Guidance in education in the first grade of school is recommended in order to prevent truancy and school retardation. The program adopted by the Thomas N. Hart School district of the Boston School System is pointed to as an excellent example.

6. School is recommended as the logical place for a guidance program since here guidance reaches all at the ages when most needed.

7. Team and individual types of athletics are recommended as preventatives since they provide an outlet for the energies of adolescence and at the same time build a healthy community spirit.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

1. Both groups in this study were delinquents. For better control in comparison, at least one non-delinquent group is recommended.

2. While court data are standardized, complete information was not available in all cases due to the

on the congested and marginal areas of the city, with special emphasis on the Roxbury district.

4. Parents should be advised to be particularly watchful of the outside activities of the first two children born. These children should not be made conscious of any particular attention given those born later.

5. Guidance in education in the first grade of school is recommended in order to prevent truancy and school retardation. The program adopted by the Thomas N. Hart School district of the Boston School System is pointed to as an excellent example.

6. School is recommended as the logical place for a guidance program since here guidance reaches all at the ages when most needed.

7. Team and individual types of athletics are recommended as preventatives since they provide an outlet for the energies of adolescence and at the same time build a healthy community spirit.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

1. Both groups in this study were delinquents. For better control in comparison, at least one non-delinquent group is recommended.

2. While court data are standardized, complete information was not available in all cases due to the

peculiar circumstances involved in some.

3. The number of cases involved was too few to provide conclusive information in some categories.

4. The personality and other important characteristics of the offenders were not included in this study, thus providing only a part of the information necessary for complete study.

5. The data used were those which were available in the court. For more significant studies a list of required data should be prepared prior to the research and information corresponding to that included in the list should be procured.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. A follow-up study of first offenders in this group.

2. A follow-up study of the school group at the Thomas N. Hart School.

3. A study of all offenders committed to training schools or subsequently committed to other institutions to check on value of the "punishment" theory.

4. Research on the families of those delinquents who have moved from marginal areas, to discover whether delinquency has continued in these families not living in an area of low delinquency.

5. A study to determine whether overt agressive behavior in school at adolescence is merely adolescent behavior or

peculiar circumstances involved in some.

3. The number of cases involved was too few to provide conclusive information in some categories.

4. The personality and other important characteristics of the offenders were not included in this study, thus providing only a part of the information necessary for complete study.

5. The data used were those which were available in the court. For more significant studies a list of required data should be prepared prior to the research and information corresponding to that included in the list should be procured.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. A follow-up study of first offenders in this group.

2. A follow-up study of the school group at the Thomas M. Hart School.

3. A study of all offenders committed to training schools or subsequently committed to other institutions to check on value of the "punishment" theory.

4. Research on the families of those delinquents who have moved from marginal areas, to discover whether delinquency has continued in these families not living in an area of low delinquency.

5. A study to determine whether overt aggressive behavior in school at adolescence is merely adolescent behavior or

the results of dissatisfaction and frustration in elementary school.

6. A study to set up a group discussion, and individual type program suitable for adolescent offenders over, at least, a twenty-four period discussion program.

7. Research into predictive factors on the basis of behavior at the elementary school level.

8. Research into the most effective methods of presenting preventative guidance to parents living in marginal economic areas.

9. Research into the relationship between runaways and homo-sexuality.

10. Research into the incidence of adventure as a cause of juvenile delinquency.

the results of disassociation and frustration in elementary school.

6. A study to set up a group discussion, and individual type program suitable for adolescent offenders over, at least, a twenty-four period discussion program.

7. Research into predictive factors on the basis of behavior at the elementary school level.

8. Research into the most effective methods of preventing preventative guidance to parents living in marginal economic areas.

9. Research into the relationship between runaways and homo-sexuality.

10. Research into the incidence of adventure as a cause of juvenile delinquency.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banay, Ralph S., Youth in Despair, New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1948. 239 pp.

Barnes, Harry Elmer and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology. Revision; New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1947. 1069 pp.

Binford, Jessie F., "Postwar Problems of Youth" Federal Probation, Volume XI., #4, October-December, 1947. p. 9.

Burt, Cyril, The Young Delinquent. London, England: University of London Press, 1938. 662 pp.

Carr-Saunders, A. M. et al., Young Offenders, An Enquiry into Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1942. 168 pp.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor T., One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934. 341pp.

_____, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up. New Commonwealth Fund, 1940. 330 pp.

Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency and the School. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1945. 337 pp.

Merrill, Maud A., Problems of Child Delinquency. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1947. 403 pp.

Nelson, Edwin C., "Prevailing Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in Brockton, Massachusetts." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston, Boston University, 1940. 102 pp.

Perkins, Honorable John F., Common Sense and Bad Boys and Other Essays. Boston: Citizenship Training Department of the Boston Juvenile Court, 1946. 154 pp.

Reckless, Walter C., Criminal Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940. 532 pp.

Reinman, John Otto, "The Truant Before the Court." Federal Probation, September 1948. Volume III., p. 11.

"Religious Bodies", Vol. 1. Washington D. C: United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. 1940. 943 pp.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacay, Ralph S., Youth in Peacetime. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1942. 239 pp.

Burgess, Harry Elmer and Healey K. Teebers, New Horizons in Criminology. Revision; New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1947. 1069 pp.

Bilford, Jessie F., "Postwar Problems of Youth" Federal Probation, Volume XI, #4, October-December, 1947. p. 9.

Burt, Cyril, The Young Delinquent. London, England: University of London Press, 1932. 602 pp.

Carr-Saunders, A. M. et al., Young Offenders, An Enquiry into Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, England: The University Press, 1942. 168 pp.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor T., One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934. 341pp.

_____, Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up. New Commonwealth Fund, 1940. 330 pp.

Kvaraceus, William C., Juvenile Delinquency and the School. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1945. 327 pp.

Merrill, Maud A., Problems of Child Delinquency. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1947. 403 pp.

Nelson, Edwin C., "Prevailing Factors in Juvenile Delinquency in Brockton, Massachusetts." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston, Boston University, 1940. 102 pp.

Perkins, Honorable John F., Common Sense and Bad Boys and Other Essays. Boston: Citizenship Training Department of the Boston Juvenile Court, 1940. 154 pp.

Reckless, Walter C., Criminal Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940. 532 pp.

Reinemann, John Otto, "The Transit Before the Court." Federal Probation, September 1948. Volume III., p. 11.

"Selected Bodies", Vol. I. Washington D. C: United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. 1940. 943 pp.

Sellin, Thorsten, "The Criminality of Youth," Prison Journal, April-July, 1940. pp. 57-58.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay, Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 451 pp.

"Social Statistics", Juvenile Court Statistics, Washington, D. C.: United States Children's Bureau, 1945. p. 11.

Sutherland, Edwin H., Principles of Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1939. 651 pp.

"United States Statistical Abstract for 1946," Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Commerce, 1946. 1,039 pp.

Wines, Enoch C., State of Prisons. Cambridge, Mass.: J. Wilson & Son, 1880. 719 pp.

DATE DUE

JAN 16	1964		
FEB 5	1964		
MAY 1 '64			
JUN 19 '64			
[illegible]			
[illegible] 19 [illegible]			
MAR 1 2 1966			
fm Use			
APR 2 6 1966			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Gallahue, Matthew J.

Factors influencing drastic increase in juvenile court...

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02563 4645

REDI COVER
USE "WJ" FASTENERS
FOR BINDING SHEETS
TO DUPLICATE REFER TO NUMBER
A Product of Wilson Jones Co., U.S.A.

Ed.

Gallahue, M.
Service paper
1949
c.2
Stored